Louisiana State University
LSU Digital Commons

LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses | Graduate School

1996

Restructuring in Louisiana Schools.

Sharon Lee Pol
Louisiana State University and Agricultural & Mechanical College

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses

Recommended Citation
Pol, Sharon Lee, "Restructuring in Louisiana Schools." (1996). *LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses*. 6364.
https://digitalcommons.lsu.edu/gradschool_disstheses/6364

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at LSU Digital Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in LSU Historical Dissertations and Theses by an authorized administrator of LSU Digital Commons. For more information, please contact gradetd@lsu.edu.

INFORMATION TO USERS

This manuscript has been reproduced from the microfilm master. UMI films the text directly from the original or copy submitted. Thus, some thesis and dissertation copies are in typewriter face, while others may be from any type of computer printer.

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted. Broken or indistinct print, colored or poor quality illustrations and photographs, print bleedthrough, substandard margins, and improper alignment can adversely affect reproduction.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send UMI a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if unauthorized copyright material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.

Oversize materials (e.g., maps, drawings, charts) are reproduced by sectioning the original, beginning at the upper left-hand corner and continuing from left to right in equal sections with small overlaps. Each original is also photographed in one exposure and is included in reduced form at the back of the book.

Photographs included in the original manuscript have been reproduced xerographically in this copy. Higher quality 6" x 9" black and white photographic prints are available for any photographs or illustrations appearing in this copy for an additional charge. Contact UMI directly to order.

UMI

A Bell & Howell Information Company
300 North Zeeb Road, Ann Arbor MI 48106-1346 USA
313/761-4700 800/521-0600

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

RESTRUCTURING IN LOUISIANA SCHOOLS

A Dissertation

Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the
Louisiana State University and
Agriculture and Mechanical College
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

in

The Department of Administrative and Foundational Services

by
Sharon Lee Pol
B.S., Louisiana State University, 1971
M. Ed., Louisiana State University, 1979
Ed. Spec., Louisiana State University, 1981
M.L.S., Louisiana State University, 1986
December, 1996

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

UMI Number: 9720378

UMI Microform 9720378
Copyright 1997, by UMI Company. All rights reserved.

This microform edition is protected against unauthorized
copying under Title 17, United States Code.

UMI
300 North Zeeb Road
Ann Arbor, MI 48103

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Dedication

This work is dedicated to my mother and father, Lorraine and Warren Pol, for all they have done for me.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Acknowledgements

It would be impossible thank everyone who helped me with this work. It was a team effort, and I want them to know their help was appreciated.

First, to Charles B. Teddlie, Ph.D., who has been my mentor, my employer, my neighbor, and my friend. Second, to Spencer Maxcy, Ph.D., who was my first teacher in graduate school. For more than twenty years he has encouraged me in my studies and pushed me toward the completion of my education. Third, to Diane Taylor, Ph.D., who offered her help and knowledge in the development of this work. I would also like to thank my committee members, Richard Fossey, Ph.D., James Fox, Ed.D., and William Doll, Ph.D., for all their help and encouragement.

My family, especially my sister Rene', made this all possible. Without Rene's help, this work would never have been completed. I also want to thank my daughter, Leigh, who was patient with me throughout her motherless times. My parents and everyone around me contributed much comfort and support, but none were as encouraging as Richard. Richard has dedicated the last few months to making this endeavor positive and meaningful, and I thank him very much.

To my colleagues and friends Susan, Robin, Lysah, Scott, Park, Mickey, John, and Catherine, I appreciate all the help and confidence they gave me. I needed their support and I was never disappointed.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table of Contents

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

List of Tables

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

List of Figures

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Abstract

This study employs both quantitative and qualitative techniques to study the restructuring processes at the district, school, and teacher levels. The quantitative procedures include surveys used to distinguish between teachers's perceptions of highly and moderately restructured schools. Qualitative research techniques included interviews, observations, and document analysis to describe the restructuring.

A new instrument, the Attributes of School Restructuring Scale(ASRS), was developed to measure teachers' knowledge about restructuring efforts and their involvement in the restructuring projects. The final version of the ASRS, included 48-items spread across three subscales: Budget/Finance, Governance/Decision-Making, and Curriculum/Instruction.

The quantitative results from the statewide study indicated that the ASRS successfully differentiated highly restructured from moderately restructured schools on 36 of the 48 items. Results also indicate that the teachers perceived there to be a greater difference between highly and moderately restructured schools on the individual teacher involvement items than on the school responsibility items (19 out of 24 comparisons).

A validation study of the ASRS indicated that it had appropriate item-total score correlations (.30-.65), subscale-total score correlations (.78-.94), and correlations among subscale scores (.56-.67). A series of factor analyses

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

established the construct validity of the ASRS. Internal-consistency estimates of reliability (coefficient alpha) for the modified inventory of 40 items was .91, This validation study established the face validity, construct validity, and reliability of the ASRS.

The case studies included five pairs of schools, and the two schools (Pickett and Sherman) from the most restructured district (Wheeler) were compared using a cross-site analysis (All names are pseudonyms). The ten schools selected for this study, were also compared using a cross-site analysis. A distinguishing pattern emerged in this analysis, which indicated that the more highly a school was restructured, the stronger are the dimensions of contrast. District support and refined organizations structures sustained the highly restructured schools through a series of important changes. Results of the cross-site analysis point to a single restructured district and schools, with moderately restructured schools faring less well.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter 1
Introduction

Reform Efforts Over the Last 30 Years

The current restructuring movement is the most significant and serious attempt at school reform of the past quarter century. "Like most educational reform movements, however, it is at risk because many of its advocates oversimplify it and fail to consider the serious underlying issues which must be dealt with before change can occur" (Tye, 1992, p.14). To truly understand these underlying issues, it is useful to first review the history of reform efforts in the U. S. over the past thirty years.

There have been five general eras of school reform in the U. S. since the late 1950s:

(1) Response to scientific accomplishments in the USSR. This era lasted from the late 1950s into the early 1960s and was characterized by top-down reform efforts;

(2) Reforms associated with the Civil Rights Movement. These reforms occurred in the 1960s and into the 1970s and were associated with redressing social inequities;

(3) Acknowledgement of the failed implementation of previous reforms. During the 1970s Goodlad and his colleagues and other researchers, criticized

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

previous reform efforts for their failure to take into consideration the impact of the innovations on teachers and students and the teaching/learning process;

(4) Appearance of two educational reform " waves" during the 1980s. The first wave of educational reforms was a response to low academic performance, which was blamed on instruction and quality of teachers. The second wave involved empowering teachers rather than managing them, and focused on bottom-up reform; and

(5) Emergence of restructuring, the most significant reform movement, during the late 1980s. A wide variety of educational reforms aimed at the school level has been subsumed under the title of restructuring.

The first two eras of reform were characterized by top-down change. During the first period, the government tried to reform schools specifically in the areas of science and math, while during the second period the government attempted to redress social inequities through schools, which increasingly became arenas for social change. Money was funneled to the states to fuel these efforts through the passage of The Elementary and Secondary Act of 1965, which addressed both the deficiencies in education and social inequality.

The third era of reform lasted throughout the 1970s and into the early 1980s. According to Darling-Hammond & Berry (1988), this period focused on improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the existing educational structures.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This era of failure was characterized by critics as one where billions of dollars were wasted on poorly conceived, politically popular reforms (Johnson, 1990). Fullan (1993) states, "The economy was stagnant; there was a surplus of teachers; and from an innovation perspective, the focus was on 'failed implementation' " (p. 119). The later half of the 1970s saw a shift from the failed implementation efforts chronicled by the researchers, to a search for factors related to successful implementations.

The fourth era of school reform initiatives occurred in the 1980s in response to the futility of attempting to implement one innovation at a time, even substantial innovations. This period is divided into two overlapping waves of reform, the first occurring from 1983-87 and the second occurring from 1987 to 1990 (e.g., Murphy, 1990; Hanson, 1991; Hargesheimer, 1988). In the first wave the federal government "back peddled from its educational role, and state governments quickly and enthusiastically stepped in" (Hanson, 1991, p. 33). State mandated reforms were punitive policies directed at the teachers, who were targeted as the primary problem. Because this first wave left the old educational structures in place, it did not die, but was gradually overlapped by a second wave of reform.

This second wave of educational reform changed direction with the release of three important reform documents in 1986 (A Nation Prepared for the 21st Century, A Time for Results, Tomorrow's Teachers). The new direction of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

reform pointed toward transforming or restructuring the system, rather than fixing an infrastructure which was flawed or impotent. A bottom-up approach, utilizing teachers as the solution, was advocated (Murphy, 1990; Hanson, 1991; Hargesheimer, 1988). Writers from this period concluded that since teachers had been assigned society's most difficult task, that of educating future citizens, they needed the authority to resolve the problems that arise. The message espoused by Schlechty (1988), underlying the "second wave" of education reform is that nothing short of the fundamental restructuring of schools will suffice if the economic and social health of the nation is to be assured. Schlechty adds that "schools are not established to solely meet the needs of students, but schools are established to meet society needs as well" (p.1). An outgrowth of this second wave of reform was that the concept of empowerment of teachers and schools took hold.

The last era is school restructuring, which emerged in the late 1980's as a school-based reform focused on the "restructuring" of an outmoded educational system. Fullan (1993) identified the 1990s as the era of "systemic reform". The previous "eras" dealt with educational and social reforms, implementation problems, and multiple innovations, only to discover that school reform is much more complex and requires change in all parts of the system of schooling. Restructuring emerged as the current avenue of change twenty years after Goodlad (1970) concluded that nothing short of "simultaneous reconstruction of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

school organizations would suffice" for significant educational change and school improvement. The next section of this chapter will describe that era in more detail, since the current study uses restructuring as a framework.

The school effectiveness and school improvement movement that has occurred over the last thirty or more years has also had an impact on school restructuring efforts. As a response to the Coleman Report (1966), school effectiveness research in the 1970s often focused on identifying effective elementary schools in poor urban areas (e.g. Edmonds, 1979). This led to school improvement efforts based on the "correlates" of school effectiveness, whereby, ineffective schools were to be transformed into more effective schools through the adoption of these correlates (e.g., Lezotte, 1990). Critics (e.g., Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993; Slater & Teddlie, 1993) have noted that these correlate-driven school improvement efforts failed to take into consideration the process of school change and the importance of context in which the school existed. Current theory in school effectiveness calls for contextually sensitive models of improvement that emphasize the process through which change occurs. This is, of course, very similar to what restructuring theorists describe in their writings.

Glickman (1993) states that the educational agenda has been opened up in the 1990s to included more than just reforms in instruction (Taylor, 1992). These new calls are for "decentralization, site-based management, flexibility of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

resources, non-graded schools, interdisciplinary curriculum, differentiated staffing, etc." (Glickman, 1993, p.87). Glickman (1993) cautions that no matter what they are called or what package these changes are wrapped in, they are all still being implemented with the same strategy, which requires schools to be innovative.

Framing Restructuring

Commonalities in Definitions of School Restructuring

The basic tenet of the present study is that school restructuring is a specific type of change, and restructuring, unlike reform and renewal, implies total change. It is systemic and comprehensive and focuses on overhauling or transforming the fundamental purposes of school and the basic structure and process for achieving them (Moore & Egemier, 1986). Restructuring implies fundamental change in the rules, roles, relationships, and results among communities, schools, districts, and states (Corbett, 1990). Teachers and principals in schools have the ultimate responsibility for initiating and implementing restructuring with district support. The fate of restructuring depends greatly upon what restructuring means to principals and teachers (Archbald, 1993), and each school is a part of a community that must have the willingness to create what it needs.

A review of the literature suggests that there are five commonalities in educators' perceptions of the definition of "school restructuring." First, everyone

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

is in agreement that restructuring is "change" (Conley, 1993; Elmore, 1990; Fullan, 1982,1992; Murphy, 1991). Second, this change must occur at the school level, altering the traditional concentration of control at the central office level (Chrispeels, 1992; Corbett, 1993; Elmore, 1992; Murphy, Petersen, & Hallinger, 1986). Third, the teachers and principals in schools have the ultimate responsibility for initiating and implementing restructuring with district support essential for sustaining the change (Archbald, 1993; Hansen & Liftin, 1991; Murphy, 1991; Tye, 1992). Fourth, restructuring change efforts are more global and substantively more diverse than other types of change (Chubb & Moe, 1990; Cuban, 1990; Hall & Hord, 1987; Rowley, 1991). Last, an important purpose of restructuring is to improve student experiences - changes in the classroom processes that affect students (Conley, 1991; Elmore, 1992; Murphy, et al.,1991).

Much of the literature is devoted to defining or debating what restructuring is or is not. A small portion of the literature on restructuring is empirical in nature and examines what is happening inside the schools where restructuring is being initiated and implemented. "Many research studies are currently based on false assumptions about what is happening in our schools or are directed at finding solutions to less-than-critical problems" (Tye, 1992, p.13). For the purposes of this study, it is necessary to have a clear focused operational definition of what is meant by the term "school restructuring".

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

School Restructuring as a Systemic Activity

Knowing the process of restructuring and understanding the impetus for change are critical elements in comprehending and defining "school restructuring". "Restructuring U. S. education is not a simple task and much of today's rhetoric ignores the complexities of schools and their resistance to change" (Tye,1992, p.13). A major problem school districts have is in attempting to adopt and adapt to new trends. The typical school system structure is not designed to accommodate constant and responsive change (Bailey,1992).

School restructuring is a change within and of the structure of the school. Chrispeels (1992) states that the type of change relates to the rationale behind the action of restructuring. The first type of change is teacher empowerment, which is more likely to focus on the establishment of governance structures. A second type of change is restructuring, which is based on alterations of the relationship between teachers and students, and is more likely to focus on teaching strategies and grouping of students within the classroom and in the school. A third type of change focuses on the control of a school budget and financial structures within the school apart from outside control. The combinations of these three types of change obviously involves the entire "system" of the school and of the district in which the school resides.

Restructuring can thus be thought of as a "systemic activity and one must be able to distinguish restructuring from less substantive efforts in order to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

separate restructuring from rhetoric" (McKenzie, et al., 1992, p.1). Much of the literature on school change has focused on planned educational change, describing implementation of innovations, such as new reading programs, individualized instruction, and use of learning centers (Fullan, 1982). The difficult part is in discovering the types of change and whether they are superficial or substantial in practice. Individual innovations may be helpful in a troubling situation, and if successful, they may be part of the solution, but they are not true restructuring which cuts deep and has widespread effects.

Self- Designed Change

The current study is an examination of schools and systems restructured by self-designed plans (Mohrman & Cummings, 1989), which allow for organization members to select strategies from many change areas. Mohrman and Cummings (1989) state that change can occur at both the district and the school level. The idea for self-designed change is that systems, schools or districts, need a number of choices to make restructuring work. In response to their own need for particular change, schools will react in many different way. Self-designed change depends upon the context within which the school operates. Inevitably, the responsibility for defining and implementing school restructuring will fall to those most able to adapt to local conditions: the principal and teachers at the school site. Rowley (1991) calls for a new mindset of engaging in sustained dialogue, inquiry, and risk taking in order for schools to restructure and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

make a break with the past. This self-designed change should foster individual and institutional commitment, which is essential to effective restructuring.

Self-designed change captures the essence of the definition of school restructuring, which espouses the philosophy that change must be personal and responsive to the conditions and context of the change. There are innumerable avenues of change in the literature and in the minds of members of the educational community. Selecting the proper strategies to foster successful restructuring maybe compared to ordering food from a menu. The real "trick" is to design a "meal" that will produce the desired outcomes for the particular school under reform. Schools and systems that restructure are choosing for themselves strategies consistent with their "vision" of the restructuring effort.

Components of School Restructuring Used in the Current Study

A set of widely used components associated with restructuring were employed as the framework for the current study, instead of a formal definition of school restructuring. The Three Components of School Restructuring, described in Figure 1.1, were assembled for this study based on: (1) the previously described commonalities in educators' perceptions of the definition of "school restructuring"; (2) a meta-analysis of 16 restructuring studies conducted by Bailey (1992) entitled Power to the Schools - School Leader's Guidebook to Restructuring; and (3) a review of the current school restructuring literature.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The resulting Three Components of School Restructuring defined in this study are: (1) Budget/Finance-Fiscal Responsibility; (2) Decision-Making/Governance; and (3) Curriculum and Instruction. The categories

BUDGET/FINANCE FISCAL RESPONSIBILITY	DECISION-MAKING GOVERNANCE	CURRICULUM/ INSTRUCTION
School Budget Management	Site Base Management	Restructuring Programs
Substitute Pay Utilities	Collaborative Work Cultures	Restructuring Timetables
Auxiliary Support	Shared Decision Making	New Designs/ Teaching-Learning
Mix of Professionals	Decentralization	Professional Development
Source of Supply	Empowerment	Special Parent Programs
Carry Over Resources - Next Fiscal Year	Common Planning	Restructuring of Teacher Education
	Integrate Community	Assessment
	School Choice	Reorganize School Calendar
	School/Industry Collaboration	New Roles for Teachers (mentor, coach)
	Voucher	

Figure 1.1

The Three Components of School Restructuring

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

included under the three components were developed using the same literature sources, which are described in greater detail in Chapter 2.

These Three Components of Restructuring were utilized in conducting the quantitatively-oriented phase of the current study. Other frames of reference, however, became important as the qualitatively-oriented case studies evolved. These frames of references are associated with the change process at three different levels: the teacher, the principal, and the district.

Chrispeels (1987) states that instructional leadership by principals and teachers shapes the context of student learning through school climate and culture, curriculum and instruction, and school organizational structures which result in classrooms that lead to effective student outcomes. The full scope of the interactions must occur within the scope of a school effectiveness and restructuring program, if it is to positively impact student learning. School change must be occurring at both the school and classroom level, with each reinforcing the other. There is other evidence (Chrispeels and Pollack, 1989; Murphy, Petersen, & Hallinger, 1986) that district effectiveness enhances school effectiveness, which means that school change needs to be examined within the context of systemwide change.

Teachers in Change

One conceptual basis for studying the impact of change on teachers has been the Concerns-Based Adoption Model (CBAM), originally proposed by

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Hall, Wallace & Dossett (1973). Extensive studies have resulted in publications on several major dimensions of the model, especially the concept of the seven Stages of Concern About the Innovation (SoC) from the perspective of the classroom teacher. These stages are:

(1) Awareness of problems and accurate sharing information;

(2) Informational concerns, creating clear channels of communication;

(3) Personal concerns of teachers fearful or anxious about change;

(4) Management concerns which demand practical answers to logistical problems;

(5) Consequence concerns which bring in outside assistance to aid teachers;

(6) Collaboration concerns which encourage and not force teachers to form a community adaptable to change; and

(7) Refocusing concerns, the final stage where teachers refine solutions and help others who are struggling with change (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, p. 32).

There are several basic premises underlying the CBAM. These include (1) change is a process, not an event; (2) understanding the change process in organizations requires an understanding of what happens to individuals as they are involved in change; (3) for the individual, change is a highly personal experience; (4) for the individual, change entails developmental growth in terms

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of feeling about and skill in the innovations; and (5) information about the change process collected on an ongoing basis can be used to facilitate the management and implementation of the change process (Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall, & Loucks, 1988, p.7). The Stages of Concern focus on the individual users of the innovation and address the person's perceptions, feelings, and motivations relative to the innovation.

Principals in Change

Principals are in the most advantageous position to be the change facilitator at their individual schools. They may adapt to change in many ways, both positive and negative, which may facilitate or negate the restructuring process in their school. A principal, who is a change facilitator, can be both leader and manager on a broader scale than principals who administer a traditional school. Change facilitators do not have to be the principal, but as the leader of a school, it is important for the principal to have a grasp on the changes occurring at the school and their role in the process. "A basic tenet of successful change management is that someone must be in charge, the locus of control must be clearly identified, and the facilitator must be skilled and prepared to act" (Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall, & Loucks, 1988, p. 3).

Principals who act as change facilitators in restructuring efforts can be understood by using part of the Concerned Based Adoption Model, which

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

contains six categories of actions which describe a change facilitator's role in the change process: (1) developing support though organizations within the school; (2) training teachers and others who have a role to play in change; (3) consulting and reinforcing in small groups and in one-on-one sessions; (4) monitoring data and providing feedback about progress and problems; (5) external communication which reports to parents, district, and community; and, (6) dissemination of material and promotion of innovations (Hord, Rutherford, Huling-Austin & Hall, 1987, pp. 74-78).

District Support for Change

It is "of primary importance" that the districts decide what their children need and how best to provide them with it. If the district has allowed aspects of restructuring within their system, it will be useful for researchers to know what kind of support has been given and how valuable it has been. School districts have the responsibility to care for schools, which have varying kinds and levels of problems. There are some questions about support which may aid in the discovery of how deep the change has been in the district. With regard to a larger vision, it may be useful to know what goals the district has set for education and what values it considers as important. While it may be useful to know about district problems, it is also useful to know what kind of future is anticipated if changes do not occur. It may be of value to a study of restructuring

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to discover how much change the district will tolerate in instruction and curriculum.

The district may be the driving force behind restructuring, but it may also be only a passive, if not a hindering one. Questions about fiscal policies, organizational structures, and power-sharing will form the framework which decides how much influence a district has on restructuring (David, 1990; Hallinger & Yanofsky, 1990). Additional issues concern the training of teachers and the political stability or instability of the superintendent and the school board. Restructuring may be impossible in a divisive district, which is not willing to share power with those outside the central office, and it will be interesting and informative to see if districts are willing to be open about their problems.

Statement of the Problem

Given the rhetoric surrounding "school restructuring" and given the fact that definitions of this species of educational change differ in the research literature and in practice, the degree to which school restructuring is actually occurring in the United States is problematic. An attempt to locate successful restructuring schools during the 1991-92 school year was sponsored by the Louisiana State Department of Education (LSDE) and conducted by Applied Technology Research Corporation (McKenzie, Baldwin, & DeVille, 1992). Restructuring Schools, the final survey report, represented only 50% of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

State's 66 districts. While the response rate was acceptable, many areas of the State that were supposedly heavily involved in restructuring did not respond. The primary purposes of the project were to provide the LSDE with a mechanism to examine the concepts of restructuring schools, and to aid in determining the Department's leadership role in supporting and assisting local restructuring efforts. The study also attempted to identify successful efforts in Louisiana which could be utilized as models for programmatic change.

The present study is a follow-up to the McKenzie, et al. (1992) research , with the goal of actually finding and describing successful school restructuring efforts. The current study utilizes a more geographically representative sample and makes queries at the district, principal, and teacher level. The present study asked several questions such as, "How successful and to what extent have Louisiana public elementary schools been in restructuring?"

The purpose of this study is to describe and analyze the successful elementary school restructuring programs within the State of Louisiana and to provide insights into the processes of initiating, implementing, and sustaining a course of school restructuring. Nine major questions are addressed by the study include the following:

1. "What districts in Louisiana are restructured based on the Three Components of Restructuring?"

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The current study uses as a guide, Three Components of Restructuring (Figure 1.1), instead of a long involved definition of "school restructuring", which is difficult to understand and follow; the Three Components of Restructuring allows the people knowledgeable about their district and schools to decide which districts are involved in which components of restructuring and to what degree.

2. "Can schools be categorized according to the extent to which restructuring has occurred in each of the areas: (a) Budget/Finance-Fiscal Responsibility, (b) Decision-Making/Governance, and (c) Curriculum and Instruction?"

Reputational criteria is often the only available assessment concerning the success of restructuring efforts. This study uses reputational criteria ,as well as other methods to assess teachers' perceptions of the degree of restructuring within the schools and the amount of teacher involvement in the restructuring effort.

3. "What is the nature of teacher and student work activities in schools that are highly restructured and moderately restructured?

Lieberman (1990) comments that few restructuring proposals have actually altered the classroom teacher's traditional role, which is to work in isolation with minimal support for instructional needs and required paperwork, with limited discretion in curricular matters, and with limited options for career advancement and professional development (Koppich, Brown, & Amsler, 1990).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

If a teacher's role is more active and open in a restructured school, it may be possible to find teachers sharing ideas and information on various levels, depending on the degree of success of the restructuring effort.

4. " How much district support is given to the selected elementary schools?"

Educational restructuring requires a "vision" of learning. Whether this vision begins at the school site (bottom-up) or is encouraged from the district (top-down), it appears that some amount of mutual commitment is necessary for restructuring to work. An open line of communication, or just the knowledge that the central office is in accordance or accepting of restructuring efforts by schools, may be enough to make a restructuring effort successful. It may also be that there is little or no relationship between the school and the central office and the restructuring efforts.

5. "Are these restructuring efforts evident and important to the teachers within the schools?"

Much of the literature concerning "school restructuring" indicates that the true test of restructuring is apparent from the teachers' perspectives, since these are the participants most affected by change. How teachers feel about and perceive change will in large part determine whether or not change actually occurs.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

6. "What is the role of the principal in these restructuring efforts within their school?"

The principal as a change agent or facilitator is important not only in initiating, but also in the implementation and sustaining of change within a school. The main premise of Hall and Hord's (1987) research is that principals and other facilitators can be more effective and change can be more important if the "concerns" of teachers are considered.

7. "What is the history of the school and district that supports and sustains the restructuring efforts?"

Recent literature on school restructuring (Chrispeels, 1992) indicates that district support is an important variable in the change process. Whether a district is active or passive in encouraging restructuring, there is usually some degree of support from the district level. It is critical in understanding the evolution of support for educational reform to discover the past history of support and reform. If there is a past history of aggressive reform, or back peddling on needed change, the efforts of restructuring in the district and the schools may be different.

8. "Where did the impetus come from for the restructuring effort?"

The impetus for change can come from many sources. Change agents or facilitators can be principals, teachers, district personnel, intermediate and higher educational personnel, and others who, for a brief or extended period, begin and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

assist various individuals and groups in developing the competence and confidence needed to use a particular innovation (Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall, & Loucks, 1988). Where the impetus for restructuring comes from also answers the question who does the impetus come from for restructuring.

9. "What changes in classroom instruction and learning has occurred as a result of the school restructuring efforts?"

Instruction in restructured schools often extends far beyond the established boundaries of traditional subject matter. Standard instructional materials such as textbooks, workbooks, and curriculum guides do not reflect the latest research on learning theory or instructional methodology. Restructured schools may embrace reconfigured learning environments, peer teaching, integrated curriculums, performance-based assessment, and a variety of other non-traditional courses of action.

Overview of the Study

This study employs both quantitative and qualitative techniques to examine the effect that the restructuring processes have, not only on the teachers in the classroom, but also on the principal as a change agent, and on the type and degree of district support for the restructuring effort. The present study was conducted over three phases to answer the research questions listed above:

(1) an instrument development phase, wherein a protocol was created to elicit information from teachers about the degree of restructuring at their schools;

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(2) a quantitative phase, which determined if there were numerically defined distinctions between schools that were by reputation differentially successful in terms of restructuring; and

(3) a qualitative case study phase, wherein the processes of successful school restructuring were explained in greater detail.

In the current study, research question #1 was answered during the instrument development phase. Research question #2 was answered during the quantitative phase. The last seven research questions (#3-9) were answered during the qualitative case study phase of the study. The overall purpose of the study was accomplished through the triangulation of data and methods provided during these three phases.

Significance of the Study

School restructuring currently underway in the U. S. is widespread, therefore, research regarding different approaches to restructuring should benefit educators. Liebermann and Miller (1990) state, "we must examine the practices of schools engaged in restructuring -- looking at nuances, processes, and the ideas that guide them" (p. 761). This study investigates Louisiana schools attempting to change their structures to meets the needs of students in the future. As others have noted, what works in school districts undergoing change may be context specific, but what matters is universal (Liebermann & Miller, 1990). The results of this study should contribute to the growing evidence as to what works

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and what matters in school restructuring. The process of self examination using the Attributes of School Restructuring ASRS (Appendix 1) should help school districts assess where they are in the restructuring process, so that they may take actions to facilitate their journey.

Organization of the Study

The study is organized into six chapters. Chapter 1 is an introduction and explanation of the framework of the study. Chapter 2 is a related literature review arranged by the main components of the study and conceptual support components. Chapter 3 is an explanation of the methodology employed in the study including the study limitations. Chapter 4 contains the quantitative results of the statewide study and the development and validation of the restructuring instrument Attributes of School Restructuring Scale (ASRS). Chapter 5 contains the qualitative results of the study in a comparative case study format. Chapter 6 includes conclusions, implications, and a discussion of further research needs.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter 2
Literature Review

Introduction

The decades of the 1960s and 1970s were noted for the push to implement new educational programs, many of which were related to technical innovations (i.e., television instruction, teaching machines). The pressure for many of these changes came from the government or outside agencies (i.e.,Title 1, Public Law 94-142), and not from the schools (Chrispeels, 1992). Murphy (1990) explains that these early reform initiatives continued through the 1980s and subsequently focused exclusively on tightening educational standards, requiring educators to work harder, and developing more effective methods to hold schools accountable for their outcomes. Beginning with the 1986 release of three highly influential reform documents from the Carnegie Forum, the Holmes Group, and the National Governor's Association respectively, "the current era of educational reform shifted directions, from repairing the existing infrastructure of schooling to restructuring or transforming the entire educational enterprise" (Murphy, Evertson, & Radnofsky, 1990, p. 2). Serious attempts to reinvent schooling have been underway ever since. While initial restructuring efforts focused on empowering teachers, more recent efforts have centered on school-based management (SBM) and parental choice.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In order to understand restructuring, an investigation into the meaning of the term within the educational context is necessary. Restructuring as educational change involves not only systemic change, the role of teachers in change, the effect of leadership in change, and districts in change; but also the areas of budget/finance-fiscal responsibility, decision-making/governance, and curriculum/instruction. Because restructuring is change, all aspects of schooling are reactive to that change. Restructuring can cause changes in systems, teachers, or leadership to be fostered or hindered.

The present chapter presents each of the topics as a basis for understanding the present research. The following sections detail an overview of the previously cited topics and how these are integrated to form an understanding of school restructuring. This chapter concludes with a summary of the main issues.

Definition of School Restructuring

Reform, Renewal, Restructuring

The term "school restructuring" is difficult to define, but it focuses on comprehensive change in the educational structure in general and schools in particular. The fact that the term restructuring is a broadly encompassing term makes it difficult to delineate between radical school reform, renewal, innovation, and reconfiguration of schools.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Conley (1993) attempts to sort out the confusion between school reform, school renewal, program innovation, and restructuring. He agrees that these are all changes which alter the existing school, stating:

> Changes that fall into the reform category are those that alter existing procedures, rules, and requirements to enable the organization to adapt the way it functions to new circumstances or requirements. Two important features help to identify and define reform-oriented efforts: One, changes center on procedural elements, the policies and procedures that determine the basic "rules of the game" for all participants in the system; and, two, the impetus for reform almost always comes from some external force, such as a board of education, a state department of education, or even educational reformers. (p. 14)

Renewal activities, as defined by Conley (1993), are "those that help the organization to do better and/or more efficiently that which it is already doing. Most school improvement projects fall into this category, as do many district-sponsored staff development programs" (p.14). Program innovations are curriculum and instruction changes such as Success for All, Accelerated Schools, or the Coalition of Essential Schools.

Fullan (1992) concedes the "terms innovation, reform, and restructuring are loosely and inconsistently used in the literature. Of the three, innovation is less sweeping... reform and restructuring refer to more fundamental and potentially sweeping changes" (p. 116). The terms used to describe changes in education are interchangeable and are likely to be used improperly when characterizing single change (innovation) or multiple change (systemic reform). These changes need to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

be linked to a particular initiative, in order to be completely understood, making use of the correct term secondary to the change.

Organizational Structures

School restructuring is a change within the structure of the school. Chrispeels (1992) states that the type of change that is occurring relates to the rationale behind the action of restructuring. First of all, teacher empowerment as a type of change focuses on the establishment of governance structures. Second, restructuring based on the rationale of altering the relationship between teachers and students focuses on teaching strategies and grouping of students within the classroom and in the school. A third type of change focuses on the control of a school budget and financial structures within the school apart from outside control.

Restructuring involves fundamental changes in the ways schools are organized. These organizational structures include student grouping, daily schedules, and classroom arrangements that foster innovative teaching approaches. The precise nature and priority of those organization changes are in dispute. "Restructuring implies total change, an examination of values, a coalition of leadership and change agents united in a common purpose, and disregard for orthodox notions about the nature of schools" (McKenzie, Baldwin, DeVille, 1992, p. 5). The organizational structures of a school must be altered in order for restructuring to occur. There is a difference between the organizational changes at the school level and organizational changes of state or district agencies.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

"Organizational structures can be defined as the roles, rules, and relationships (legal, political, economic, and social) that influence how people work and interact in an organization" (Newmann, 1989, p.5). Examples of the reversals in the organizational structures of schools found during restructuring are: a change in governance from the principal to teacher cadres or school management teams; teachers performing jobs normally designated to other personnel; and, principals becoming teachers instead of teacher leaders. Corbett (1990) agrees with Newmann that roles, rules and relationships are basic components of organizational structures, but includes results as a necessary and integral component. Corbett's rationale is that restructuring by its nature forces conjunctive changes in these four components at the same time. For instance, a restructuring effort cannot change curriculum policy (the rules) without making simultaneous changes in the roles teachers play, the relationships between teachers, administrators, parents and students, and the assessment results that are used to judge the new policy's effectiveness (McKenzie, Baldwin, & DeVille, 1992).

The organizational structures of American schools resist change, but changes do occur in the values, leadership, roles, and relationships (Murphy, 1991). Restructuring is met with resistance at many levels and from many interests. School districts, school boards, parents, and communities are all sources of resistance to restructuring efforts. Fullan and Miles (1992) describe resistance

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

on all these levels as failure to "buy in", complacency, unwillingness to alter behaviors, and failure to recognize the need for change.

Thus, restructuring can be thought of as a systemic activity which causes change at all levels in differing degrees. One must be able to distinguish restructuring from less substantive efforts in order to separate restructuring from rhetoric (McKenzie, Baldwin, DeVille, 1992). Much of the literature on school change has focused too tightly on planned educational change, which is sometimes segmented and uncoordinated. The literature also is heavy with descriptions of implementation of innovations, such as new reading programs, individualized instruction, or use of learning centers (Fullan, 1982).

School Climate/Culture

Fullan (1992) says that there is a relationship between "restructuring" and "reculturing", which is establishing a culture conducive to change. "Change cultures encompass the values, beliefs, norms, and habits of collaboration and continuous improvements" (p.131). School restructuring is a change in school culture. The concepts of culture and its use to examine and explain organizational life have been drawn from anthropology. "In anthropology, culture is the foundation term through which the orderliness and patterning of much of our life experience is explained" (Smirchich, 1983, p.341). Chrispeels (1992) feels that this anthropological definition does not capture "school" culture. School culture is the set of rituals and performances within a school which are the school

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

behaviors, shared beliefs, symbols, rituals, and stories of organization. School restructuring challenges traditional rituals and performances, and seeks to replace these with new ones. Such challenges to these traditions include year round school, non-standardized curriculum, and school controlled finances. The school culture is shaped by principals, teachers, and pupils, and they have most to gain or lose from change in structure.

One outcome of the restructuring process is a shift in the culture of the school from an emphasis on traditional routines and bureaucratic rigidity, toward a culture that actively supports the view that much of the knowledge needed to plan and carry out change in schools is possessed by the people in the schools themselves. Further, it recognizes that the "a school faculty and its principal constitute... or should constitute a natural team. Moreover, parents and students usually give their allegiance to schools, rather than to a state or district" (Guthrie, 1986, p. 306). Therefore, the optimal unit for educational change is the single school with its pupils, teachers, principal, and parents - those who live there every day - as primary participants.

Newmann (1993) cautions that we must pay careful attention to school culture, which affects how organizational structures (e.g., school-site councils, teacher mentors, heterogeneous grouping, longer school days) are used. "Structures provide opportunities, limits, incentives, and sanctions that affect school culture. The interaction between the structures and the culture are

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

important" (p. 8). These organizational structures produce valued outcomes, but how these structures affect the school culture must be determined through research that targets this phenomena.

Educational Change

Restructuring as Change

Restructuring can be viewed as an educational change within the context of organizational structures. Conley (1991) and Fullan (1992) are in agreement concerning the three levels of school change: (a) renewal, making more effective what is already done; (b) reform, altering existing procedures to adapt to new circumstances; and (c) restructuring, changing fundamental assumptions, practices, and relationships to improve student learning and profoundly affect educational practices.

Elmore and associates (1991) noted that the term restructuring usually has technical, political/social, and occupational orientations. The four levels that Elmore describes, which parallel Newmann's (1993), are the organizational structures that are changed or altered within a restructuring framework.

Newmann and others (1989) state that restructuring implies fundamental change in the rules, roles, relationships, and results among schools, districts, and states. These rules, roles, relationships, and results complete the linking of the organization structures posited by Elmore (Corbett, 1990). The Social Structure can be changed through rules; the Occupational Structure of school personnel can

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

be changed by changing the roles of the participants; the Political Structure or power base can be changed by altering the relationships of the power sources; and the Technical Structure or measures of success can be changed by the results of the effort.

Fullan and Miles (1992) feel that restructuring has taken on a particular focus. Restructuring takes many forms, but usually involves school-based management; enhanced roles for teachers in instruction and decision making; restructured programs and timetables, collaborative work cultures, and new designs for teaching-learning; new roles such as mentors, coaches and other teacher leadership arrangements.

Undertaking school restructuring processes requires looking at change from an organizational perspective. One of the factors that differentiates implementation of innovations from school improvement and school restructuring efforts is that the scope of the change will be broader (e.g., changing the school's approach to reading rather than just purchasing the current edition of a basal reader). Fullan (1990) has argued that there is a need to systematically focus on institutional development, as opposed to staff development, although staff development remains an essential element of institutional development.

Glickman (1993) postulates that educational restructuring requires a vision of learning, examples of visionary school-level restructuring, and a coordinated plan at the local, state, and national levels for inviting and helping schools accept

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

choice, responsibility, and accountability. Everyone must get involved with restructuring including politicians, citizens, universities, professional associations, and educational bodies. Tewel (1992) suggests that "school restructuring is whole school-based reform within a shared decision-making framework" (p. 103). Glickman (1993) is in agreement with Tewel that restructuring is a school-level reform, but would include all elements of the community in the shared-decision framework.

Bailey (1992) provides a knowledge base from which to converse with constituents regarding the definition of and need for restructuring. A meta-analysis matrix was constructed which represents opinions of experts and theory about restructuring and the characteristics mentioned in the literature. "The matrix provides a "picture" of the popular meaning of restructuring. The most popular conception of restructuring is that it means decentralization followed by professionalism both of which are related to empowerment" (Bailey, 1992, p. 13). Student outcomes and better use of instructional time are the next most frequently cited. Restructuring means improved accountability, the next characteristic noted by Bailey. The definition gained from this meta-analysis is that restructuring means to decentralize, to gain professionalism, and to empower. These changes will improve accountability, student learning, and the use of time. Public schools have evolved in such a way that the basic organizational structure, operational practices, and normative behavior, resist anything that's threatening to the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

organization. Bailey (1992) "submits that most of the real and imagined problems besieging the schools today are related to the basic organizational power and structure of public school districts" (p. xii). He advocates the changing of the basic structure of school district organizations - "in other words, restructure - and use this power more effectively - in other words empower" (p.xiii).

School restructuring, for most experts reviewed by Bailey (1992), means decentralization. The school building in a decentralized organization of a school system is the most affected. Wohlstetter and Odden (1992) argue that school-based management as a governance reform entails more than just decentralizing budget and personnel decisions, and ought to be joined with curriculum and instruction reforms so as to enhance the probability of improving educational practice. Smith and O'Day (1990) advocate systemic reform where school-based management is adopted as just one, albeit central, part of an overall reform strategy. In trying to explain a rationale for a framework of restructuring efforts, Harvey and Crandall (1988) state the nature of the concept of restructuring supports the notion of multiple options for change. Thus, it is not possible to definitively describe the areas of restructuring. Instead a multi-dimensional taxonomy should be used to provide a framework for restructuring efforts.

Systemic Change

Educational restructuring generally encompasses systemic changes in organizational purposes and core values, student experiences, organizational

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

member's roles and organizational culture, school leadership and governance structures. In addition, coordination of community resources, including connections between the school and its larger environment, and core technology, which constitutes the teaching and learning process are also part of educational restructuring (Banathy, 1991; Murphy, 1991; Newmann, 1991). To date, most restructuring efforts have concentrated on teacher empowerment, school based management, and choice (Ericson & Ellett, 1989).

Systemic reform has focused on articulating high standards for students and aligning other policies with these learning goals (Smith & O'Day, 1991). Although some may believe that a combination of standards and assessment will yield the desired results, most reformers recognize that other changes are needed to meet new achievement standards. Floden, Goertz, & O'Day (1995) report that researchers and policy makers alike have begun to advocate capacity building as a crucial component of reform. Hence, those calling for capacity building are saying that the current educational system lacks the power to achieve reform.

Anderson (1995) recommends, after reviewing research conducted in middle schools and high schools across the country, that reformers must think systemically. There is no one key to reform. Anderson (1995) suggests not limiting systemic reform to the political arena, but to attend to the culture of the school, the personal needs and dilemmas of professionals, the concerns of parents, and the role and work of students.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The relationship between content and process of organizational change has been explored by researchers studying restructuring school districts. Liebermann and Miller (1990) found that many different content/process combinations exist for individual school districts, none of them being "right" or "wrong." However, the study did find that both content and process are necessary (Libermann & Miller, 1990). A vision without accompanying commitment, support, and structures to foster organizational learning will have no chance of becoming reality. But a process for restructuring without an accompanying vision will falter as well. Each school system, starting with its own set of conditions, must understand that, while content is critical, the process for building commitment to change and fostering continuous learning must also be present (Libermann & Miller, 1990).

Smith and O'Day (1990) provide a rationale for "systemic" strategies for comprehensive restructuring. Assessment, curriculum and instruction, staff development, personnel selection and promotion, and state/district/school action, formerly uncoordinated, should be systematically linked. It is the coordination of the efforts that is difficult to achieve. Planning and timing are essential elements in comprehensive restructuring; it takes time to coordinate and implement, and even longer to see the efforts to fruition. The communication channels must be open for a continuous flow of information and feedback across all lines and levels.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Murphy (1991) suggests that restructuring generally encompasses systemic changes in one or more of the following: work roles and organizational milieu; organizational and governance structures. The ultimate purpose of restructuring schools is to improve student experiences. The most extensively restructured schools are those that represent the most extensive implementation of these criteria. The degree of restructuring at a school, however, is far less important than the ends or qualities that the school promotes.

Teachers and Change

Elmore (1979-80, 1983, 1988,1990) frequently uses the term "backward map" to maintain that revisions in organizational and governance structures should start from the student. Murphy, Everston, & Radnofsky (1991) add that "fundamental discussions about how to restructure educational processes for more effective learning should precede the restructuring of other aspects of schooling (p. 3). The teacher is the instructional specialist within a classroom. Teachers involved in restructuring can be pivotal in all components of restructuring, but the main focus should be on participation in governance and changing the curriculum and instruction to meet the needs of the students.

"Vision" has been a key theme in the school restructuring movement. Vision is typically defined as a systemic series of shared beliefs which guides action, integrates organizational activities, provides focus, and sustains commitment (Blumberg & Greenfield, 1980). Teachers and principals in schools

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

have the ultimate responsibility for initiating and implementing restructuring (Archbald, 1993). It is their vision that can sustain the restructuring focus, thereby, and eventually make it successful.

Lieberman (1990) comments that few restructuring proposals have actually altered the traditional role of the classroom teacher. One of the misleading conclusions resulting from discussions on teacher empowerment is the assumption that power exists in a finite quantity, and must be taken from principals in order to be given to teachers. Thus, the professionalization of teachers is often stymied at the local level. The collaborative culture that supports restructured schools, however, is not based on a divisive sharing of power. Instead, authority is viewed as receiving and giving expertise to arrive at commonly understood solutions. Power is not finite but expansive; there are more than enough problems to go around. In the study by Hallinger, Murphy, and Hausman (1992), principals felt that increased input from others made them better decision-makers, and gave them more time to support teacher development.

Teachers, as individuals, usually are not able to run successfully against the regularities of the school or create the schoolwide structures and processes necessary to sustain new practices (Goodlad, 1975, p. 13). Teachers have operated largely in isolation with few opportunities to interact with other teachers. With little time for interaction, teachers do not have the opportunity to develop their teaching skills in ways that enhance their own sense of self-confidence and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

efficacy (Rosenholtz, 1989). School-site management is generally aimed at strengthening principal roles, but, for a number of analysts the motive for expanding school-based decision making authority is linked to expanding teacher rather than principal influence over the school operations (Brandt, 1990; Conley & Bachrach, 1990). Site-based restructuring may alter governance procedures, but does not necessarily affect the teaching-learning core of schools (Taylor & Teddlie, 1992). Therefore, it is critical for teachers involved in a restructuring effort to assist in making changes in the governance of the school in addition to being involved in the changes affecting curriculum and instruction if the teaching and learning processes are to be altered.

When administrators try to dictate and regulate the priorities of teachers and the practices of school, they sometimes lose their effectiveness as they work their way through the organization to the classrooms (Johnson, 1991; Berman, McLaughlin, & Others, 1977; Elmore, 1983; Boyd, 1987). If a reform is to endure and to influence instruction and learning, teachers must become its advocates rather than its adversaries (Johnson, 1990).

Bacchus & Marchiafava (1991) feel that perhaps no individual is as crucial to the success of education reform as the teacher. Changes in governance, in program, and in administration have a lesser impact than what happens in the classroom between the teacher and the students. The conclusion derived from Boles' 1990 case studies of four teacher initiated restructuring programs is that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

successful school change initiated by teachers has potential benefits for all concerned. The success of such initiatives will rest on the emergence of teachers with an understanding of school structure and the politics of schools. Not all teachers are interested in such matters, but at least some must take politically-oriented roles if teachers are to empower themselves.

As Joseph Schwab (1969) has argued, curriculum development should pull from many sources and utilize multiple theories as a basis. Furthermore, continuity of curriculum is necessary both vertically from grade to grade, and horizontally across subjects and disciplines. Teachers must collaborate across grades and subject areas to tap a wide range of knowledge. In particular, teachers must have time to work together, and they must have access to outside resources (Sykes, 1991).

Popkewitz and Lind (1989) argue that while "the reform rhetoric supports improvements in teachers' working conditions, the restructuring prompted by reform efforts in fact reduces teacher responsibility through standardization of conduct, increased bureaucracy, and greater monitoring" (p.575). This finding is from a study of a teacher incentive (monetary and non-monetary) program in three Wisconsin districts, where traditional power bases in the schools negated the discourse of reform. The research focused on how project programs were interpreted and directed by the institutional contexts in which teachers and administrators operated. These researchers also refers to The Carnegie Forum on

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Teaching and the Economy and the Holmes Group Report's assertion that "schools are fairly standardized places" (p.577). The difficulty of improving the quality of teaching was buried under all the "red tape" of bureaucratic control and the incentive programs took a "back seat" to the intense daily schedules of teachers. Teachers made repeated references to the frenetic nature of the school day, which encompassed "multiple levels of achievement, control of diverse scheduling, and limited available resources" (p.577).

Restructuring efforts also have impact on professional accountability for teachers and principals. Teachers must be evaluated on their teaching effectiveness regardless of curriculum content or delivery, but the method by which they are evaluated may be quite different for different restructured schools. In addition, schools are responsible for demonstrating their effectiveness to the public and to policymakers (Darling-Hammond, Ascher, 1991).

Principal As a Change Facilitator

The duties of principals are extensive and can include a wide variety of responsibilities ranging from managerial charges to curriculum tasks. The organizational change literature has recognized that to change an organization requires leadership, not management (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Peters & Waterman, 1982). A leader is more that a manager. "A leader is proactive about future organizational goals, shaping people's beliefs, values, and attitudes and options for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the future. a manager is reactive about organization goals and uses transactional approaches to motivate his followers" (Zalenzik. 1977. p.74).

Leadership. based on traditional theories such as the Ohio State University studies (Halpin. 1966). the managerial grid model. (Blake & Mouton. 1985). and the contingency theories (Fiedler. 1971: Hersey & Blanchard. 1972: House. 1971) is often assumed to occur between a leader and a face-to-face group in a steady situation where a task is given to complete in a relatively short period of time. The drawbacks of the traditional theories is that they fail to pay attention to the transformational function of a leader (Cheng. 1996). This perspective argues that a leader is one who not only adapts his behavior to the situation. but also transforms it (Bass. 1985: Bennis. 1984: Tichy & Ulrich. 1984: Zalenzik. 1977). Strong instructional leadership by the principal. has been identified repeatedly in school effectiveness models as critical for school effectiveness. For the most part. this research has been tied to the conceptionalization that the principal is the sole source of leadership (Wimpleberg. Teddlie. & Stringfield. 1989). School restructuring and SBM models call for the principal to relinquish the sole responsibility for decisions and autonomous leadership.

Cheng (1996) and other researchers indicate that in traditional theories. duality of leadership is often emphasized in terms of the concern for people and the concern for task (Blake & Mouton. 1985: Halpin. 1966: Stogdill. 1974). Cheng (1990) argues that this may be "too simplistic and that a leader in a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

restructured situation must be more multi-dimensional because this line of thought ignores the political and cultural aspects of the organizational process and demands a more extensive type of comprehensive leadership in a restructured environment" (p.107). Cheng (1996) emphasizes that a two dimensional leader is insufficient for the school-based management mechanism or restructuring effort to pursue dynamic school effectiveness and long-term school development.

Throughout the restructuring process, participation of school members and leadership of principal/administrators are necessary and crucial. Leadership is responsible for initiating and maintaining the strategic management process (Caldwell & Spinks, 1992; Cheng, 1993), for developing a school culture that facilitates the continuous pursuit of school effectiveness and development (Schein, 1992; Sergiovanni, 1984), for ensuring quality and effectiveness in instructional activities, and for coordinating curriculum across the individual, program and school levels (Hallinger & Murphy, 1987). Participation involving multiple strategic constituencies such as teachers, students, parents, and community leaders in the strategic management process (particularly the decision making component) is very important to the success of self-management at the school level.

In the study of successful implementation of innovations, Heck, Stielgelbauer, and Hall (1984) recognized that principals did not carry out their leadership functions by themselves. In the 1984 study, Heck and others identified

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the important role of a second change-facilitator who worked closely with the principal and teachers to bring about successful change (Chrispeels, 1992). Another set of research studies has examined the principal's leadership role in relation to change. Using leadership, change, and the role of the principal in an extensive literature search, Hall and Hord (1987) found as a common theme across all three bodies of literature, that leaders are the focal point from which action, and its subsequent effects, emanates. The principal, regardless of traits, style, or familiarity with change models, is perceived as the best situated leader in the school for making school improvements. Strong principals are often those who have succeeded in achieving a shared vision and purpose by listening to and working with their staff, students, and parents to reach consensus (Stringfield, 1995).

In contrast to this line of thought, Murphy (1991) theorizes that if the relationship between the district office and the school is the key element of change in the school-based management strategy, the relationship that is most changed in the teacher empowerment strategy is that between the principal and the teachers. In an empowerment model (whether of teachers or parents or both), the principal retains an important role, but not the one of greatest centrality, which results in power-sharing by many instead of one.

A small body of research has begun to concentrate on what principals actually do in the process of facilitating change. Rosenholtz's (1989) study

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

revealed a relationship built on extensive interaction, positive support from the principal, and mutual respect in regard to technological expertise. One of the major leadership acts of the principals was to create collaborative structures that facilitated the emergence of teacher leadership.

Democracy was introduced into the restructuring debate by Maxcy (1995), who writes, "Any proposal to reform schools must take seriously the underlying values of the democratic nation in which such schools are located" (p.73). Since decision-making is the crux of restructuring, democracy may become the standard by which good school arrangement decisions can be made. A democratic leader, who makes decisions, or allows others to make decisions based on the good of the school and its population, embodies the characteristics of leadership that foster school restructuring. Maxcy emphasizes that "leadership of a transactional nature is stressed as the meliorative device for transforming culture and bringing about a new, more humane social order" (p.180).

The Chicago reform movement was an experiment in democratic leadership. During the 1980s, the Chicago public school system was under fire from many detractors. The sizable problems needed solving, and time was of the essence. The answers to the schools' problems were sought through the reallocation of district funds, and most importantly by empowering school councils to improve their schools. As Maxcy (1995) surmises, "the urban schools were

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

recast into more locally democratic units" (p.91). Leadership in the Chicago restructuring movement included the involvement all aspects of the community. The intent was to give the control of the schools back to the people within the schools. who had the most to gain and lose. In the Chicago effort. the principal took a secondary role in leadership to the parent. teacher. and community-dominated councils.

In contrast to the active involvement of the community within the Chicago framework. the Coalition of Essential Schools promoted by Ted Sizer basically ignores parents and community in the leadership sequence. The Coalition is a secondary school-university partnership that works across the country to redesign the American high school for better student learning and achievement (Muncey. 1994). The Coalition focuses on a pedagogical plan. emphasizing students needs. but omitting parents and community from the democratic process of leadership (Timar. 1989). The broad framework of the plan allows extremes of change within each school and among its members. Restructuring leadership can be democratic. involving many players both inside and outside of the school building. Shared leadership is an essential element in any restructuring plan. although the participants in the process differ from plan to plan.

English and Hill's 1990 study cautions restructuring advocates not to forget the principal. The researchers state that the "principal stands at the apex of this

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

process" (p.1). Their study on curriculum restructuring in high schools concludes with the message that "the principal is still the prime catalyst in bringing parties together...but, in the accountability arena, however, the principal stands alone. It is likely to remain that way for a long time" (pp. 22-23).

Short, Rinehart, and Eckley (1996) in their study of the relationship between teacher empowerment and principal leader orientation, found that in schools where teachers believe that they are greatly empowered, teachers view their principals as using human relation and interpersonal skills in leading the organization. Keedy and Finch (1994), in their case study of principal-teacher power sharing, found that the principal became more collegial and collaborative, reinforcing the notion of power among, rather than power above.

Districts and Change

Even though restructuring centers at the school building level, state institutional structures can provide the preliminary conditions necessary for restructuring (David, Cohen, Honetschlager, & Traiman, 1990). The same mechanisms that give state educational institutions the authority to structure schools, curriculum, and the roles of employees also provide the means to grant the flexibility needed for restructuring. State legislators, state boards of education, and state educational leaders can issue the invitation to begin the restructuring process. By issuing such an invitation, state educational institutions demonstrate that they are committed to the idea of restructuring.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Once the invitation to restructure has come from the state level, the district superintendent and the central office staff can continue the initiative by developing a positive climate for change in the schools (Hansen & Liftin, 1991). Many of the mechanisms for beginning and maintaining the restructuring process at the state, district, and local levels are the same. These include reallocating resources and re-prioritizing funding decisions, decentralizing decision making, providing options and flexibility instead of rules and regulations, and providing the necessary training and technical assistance. At the district level, coordination of school-based efforts is essential. Building-level initiatives require input through advisory councils and participatory leadership.

Experts argue that school districts must first address questions related to the core values and purposes of education (Banathy, 1991). As core values and purposes are examined in relation to society's needs, school districts will begin to achieve changes in instruction, and curriculum, student experiences, educator's roles, relationships among organizational members, organizational rules, and governance structures (Fullan, 1991; Prestine & Bowen, 1993). These interim changes are the predicted precursors to improvement in student outcomes.

The nature of a district's restructuring effort is important to understanding the type of changes needed in its accountability system. As noted above, restructuring typically means different things in different school districts. The goals of restructuring, the district and state policy framework, the level of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

authority and types of decisions decentralized at the school, the formalization and extent of power-sharing among staff, parents, and principal, and the conception(s) of teaching that drive the district's effort are just some of the factors that influence how a district addresses accountability (David, 1990; Hallinger & Yanofsky, 1990).

The most favorable configuration for meaningful change is a strong local initiative coupled with a supportive central policy. Odden and Marsh's (1988) research concludes that aggressive state leadership which couples comprehensive focus with local district and school development did have a positive impact. Nonetheless, the key variable seemed to be local district capacity. State level strategies can go only so far in affecting the district.

Schools supported by their districts avoid ad hoc innovations and focus on a variety of coordinated short-term and mid- to long-term strategies. The short-term activities include inservice professional development on selected and interrelated themes; middle to long-term strategies include vision building, initial teacher preparation, selection and induction, and promotion procedures and criteria (Fullan, 1992).

Studies by Bogotch, Brooks, Riedlinger, and Mac Phee (1992) emphasize that successful restructuring is not possible unless principals and central office staff have some common understanding about the nature of shared decision-making. Administrators limit their concepts of "innovation" to curriculum and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

instruction, and have difficulty extending these concepts to management or school organization. In addition, there is a tendency for administrators, particularly in urban systems, to minimize risk-taking and to avoid trial and error approaches to longitudinal improvement. Both central office personnel and principals view the central office as being a structure that inhibits innovation. These attitudes must be corrected if restructuring is to realize its potential.

According to Mohrman & Cummings (1989), self-designed change can occur at the school level as well as at the district level. The idea behind self designed change is that innovations that work in one school with a certain culture or group of individuals and students, may not work in another setting (Mohrman & Cummings, 1989). Change experts argue that allowing individuals and organizational units (buildings) to select from a variety of change processes facilitates the entire change process, because individuals are allowed to use those teaching strategies and to assume those roles that initially make more sense to them (Fullan, 1991; Mohrman & Cummings, 1989). Self designed change can allow individuals to develop a personal meaning for their new roles, as well as what it means to achieve equitable student outcomes. This self designed change process, can foster individual and institutional renewal, the key to educational improvement according to Fullan (1991). Each school must be designed to achieve its individual mission within the community in which it finds itself. As Fullan (1982) aptly reminds, change is bound by its context. As a result,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

restructured schools many look quite different from one another, as each reflects its own community realities, needs, beliefs, and values.

Restructuring, which starts at the school level, is a common theme of policy analysts Elmore and McLaughlin (1988). These researchers feel that school and district policies must facilitate development of solutions to educational problems, rather than mandate resource allocation, structures, and rules. "In order to find these solutions and make them work, people in the schools must be allowed the opportunity to fail and the time to succeed" (Conley, 1993, p.15). In fact, as Chubb and Moe (1990) and Louis and Miles (1990), found the most educationally successful schools have learned to give the appearance of compliance to their districts and state, yet still make their own decisions that benefit students. As Chubb (1988) reported, the more control a school has over those aspects of its organization that affect its performance - the articulation of goals, the selection and management of teachers, the specification of policies - the more likely it is to exhibit the qualities that have been found to promote effectiveness. He concludes by saying, restructuring offers "the public the means to improve their schools without losing control over them" (p.49).

Moses & Whitaker (1990) state that "for many school districts, restructuring remains an elusive concept ... unless restructuring is more clearly defined, its potential for significantly transforming schools may be lost" (p. 32).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

As local systems and states search for the keys to restructuring success, they need: (a) a clear operational definition of restructuring; (b) frameworks for examining restructuring efforts and determining priorities; (c) an historical knowledge of restructuring efforts that have been successful and unsuccessful; and, (d) the appropriate authorization, resources, and support to promote radical educational change. Only with this context can restructuring be more than a re-packaging of old ideas under a new name (McKenzie, Baldwin, & DeVille, 1992).

Components of School Restructuring

Budget/ Finance

Most site-based management programs (SBM) provides greater school-site autonomy over some combination of budget, personnel, and program decisions (Malen, Ogawa, & Kranz, 1990). Budgeting, or the allocation of resources to achieve institutional or organizational goals, is one of the most important functions of school district management. In most school districts in the United States, this function is carried out centrally, with limited input from individual school sites. In fact, one of the reasons site-based management has become more prominent in the past ten years is the availability of inexpensive, yet powerful, computing and networking tools that make it possible to transfer budget and other management information between school sites and central offices in a timely fashion (Odden & Picus, 1992).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Budgeting is only one small part of SBM and financial SBM is seldom fully implemented. More frequently, SBM is concerned with governance issues. Brown (1990), for example, states that school-based management "means simply that schools within a district are allotted money to purchase supplies, equipment, personnel, utilities, maintenance, and perhaps other services. On the other hand, Cheng (1996) asserts that "self-budgeting may provide an important condition for schools to use resources effectively according to their own characteristics and needs to solve problems in time and pursue their own goals" (p.55).

Hentschke (1988) points out that two proposed reforms of the 1960's and 1970, "Planning, Programming, Budgeting Systems (PPBS) and Zero Based Budgeting (ZBB)" did little to change school district budgeting practices. Both of these reforms were based on the premise that improved budgeting technology would lead to better decisions about the allocation of school resources. Hentschke (1988) states that an additional reason for the failure of these budgetary reforms in schools, is a that the authority relationship over the distribution of resources within school districts or schools did not change. He argues that to implement a school based budget management system, certain changes in these authority relationships are essential.

Odden and Picus (1992) list six changes in the relationship between districts and schools that can result in schools gaining control over finances that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

have been traditionally district controlled. These six changes are originally part of Hentschke's (1988) proposed authority changes for school based budgeting:

1) Authority over Utilities and Substitute Teachers
2) Authority over Staff Development, Curriculum Development, and Other Central Office Support
3) Authority over the Mix of Professionals
4) Authority over the Source of Supply
5) Authority to Carry Over Resources to the Next Fiscal Year
6) Relief from Regulation

Hentschke (1988) argued that to decentralize school management, authority relationships with school districts must change. For example, even when budgetary decisions appear to have been delegated, real expenditure authority often was not decentralized (Hentschke, 1988). In Chicago, if a school wants to fix its roof, the site council must go through the district office and use the district employees. Further, in many programs, if substitute teacher time decreases or savings are made in maintenance (e.g., utilities), the savings usually revert to the central office, thus mitigating the fiscal incentive for producing these results (Wohlstetter & Buffett, 1992).

Governance/Decision-Making

A basic tenet of restructuring philosophy is the decentralization of authority from the state and district to provide greater decision making authority at the local

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

school level. Changes in governance should not be the starting point for restructuring school. Rather the structure and process of governance and control at the state and local levels should be readjusted to accommodate and support necessary changes in the organizational management of instruction in schools and classrooms (Cohen. 1990). If schools are to be collaborative cultures for learning. then the foundation of the school must be based on collaboration as well. While governance is an issue far removed from the daily business of classroom instruction. it is a frequent and easily identifiable target of restructuring. Site based management (SBM). for some, has become synonymous with restructuring. but SBM per se is not restructuring. Indeed, what many educators call SBM is actually not SBM.

At its most basic level. SBM in restructuring involves decentralization such that local people can make local decisions that lead to local educational change and improvement. David (1996) admits that "for all its guises. SBM is basically an attempt to transform schools into communities where the appropriate people participate constructively in major decisions that affect them" (p. 4). Often an SBM system is implemented simply by setting up a council at the school site and giving the council at least some responsibility in the areas of budget. personnel. and curriculum. It is assumed that individual school councils understand their new roles and responsibilities and will take appropriate action to improve school performance. Goldman. Dunlap. and Conley (1991) describe the functions and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

responsibilities of administrators in school-based restructuring as "facilitation". This theoretical view is quite different from reality in most states where centralized decision-making is the norm and student outcomes are rarely linked to policies about school structure.

School effectiveness and school improvement research have contributed a good deal of both support and pressure for transforming school systems. (Bredson, 1993; Clark, Lotto, & Astuto, 1984; Murphy, 1990). Two of the major findings from these complementary lines of research are that school improvement is an integrated rather than a piecemeal activity and that improvement occurs on a school-by-school basis. In building upon these conclusions, it has been argued that each school should be provided with substantial autonomy and should become "the fundamental decision making unit within the educational system" (Guthrie, 1986, p. 307).

Even though teachers and administrators have expressed a desire for meaningful participation in the decision-making process, site-based decision-making has been slow in taking hold. Part of the explanation for this may be found in the traditional loose-tight, or insular, structure of schools. Cheng (1996) describes traditional school management as a type of external control management characterized by tight control from the central office of the school system. As Conley, Schmidle, and Shedd (1988) point out "perhaps the only accurate generalization is that in most school systems, boards and administrators make

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

decisions that affect more than one classroom. while teachers make decisions that affect (or seem to affect) only their own students and classrooms" (p.262). These same authors conclude that "school systems deny themselves, as systems, the opportunity to cultivate a continuously expanding body of professional and institutional knowledge that each individual can supplement. reinforce. and pass on to others" (p. 267).

"It was not until the eighties, that people began to believe that to improve education quality. it is necessary to jump from the classroom teaching level to the school organizational level and reform the structural system and management style of schools" (Cheng. 1996, p. 43). Reform movements that followed emphasized improving school internal functioning (e.g.. effective school movement searched for and promoted characteristics of effective schools. the self-budgeting school movement emphasized autonomy regarding school resources). However. some people argued that decentralization of central power to school level could not guarantee that schools would use power effectively to enhance education quality. Thus followed the emergence of the shared decision making movement in school management reform. Since that time. different forms of school-based management became the central topics and strategies in educational reform (Caldwell & Spinks. 1988: David. 1989: Dimmock. 1993: Mohrman & Wohlsetter. 1994).

Some researchers have illustrated the diverse forms of school-based management and their implementation (Brown. 1990: Chapman. 1990). but very

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

few have explained the conception and theory of school based management, and mapped its characteristics of school functioning from an organizational perspective. Caldwell and Spinks (1992) and Mohrman and Wohlstetter (1994) are two of the few who attempted to do so. These researchers' basic theory is that school management and teaching activities inevitably have difficulties and problems; therefore, schools should be given the power and responsibility to solve problems effectively where the problems happen as soon as possible.

David (1989) notes that governance and decision-making tasks are set according to the characteristics and needs of the school itself and, therefore, school members (including boards of directors, supervisor, principal, teachers, parents, and students) have much greater autonomy and responsibility for the use of resources to solve problems and carry out effective education activities for the long term development of the school. Although frequently combined with SBM and teacher work role change, restructured governance involves changing the roles of community and political leaders in addition to professional educators (Mitchell & Beach, 1993).

The most widely recognized example of governance restructuring is the Chicago plan, which has created a parent-dominated council at each school site. These councils have authority to hire the principal and have acquired other powers traditionally assigned to district-level boards of education. Other examples of governance restructuring are the Kentucky reforms that require virtually every

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

school to have a legally composed site-based council which is endowed with considerable fiscal and policy authority and the state of Colorado's plan that requires a business representative on each council to diffuse union problems (David, 1996).

In a study of restructured schools, Radnofsky, Evertson, and Murphy (1990) were disconcerted to find that the connections between school level management, teacher responsibility for governance, parent involvement, and improved instruction were minimal. They maintain that fundamental discussions about how to restructure should not begin with the concept of SBM. Instead, schools should as Elmore (1989,1990) suggest "backward map", that is, examine how schools should bring about effective learning at the student level and then examine issues such as governance and staffing from that perspective.

English and Hill (1990) found that teacher unions see empowerment as the driving force behind restructuring. Legislative reformers view restructuring as a way to deflate what they see as the bloated bureaucracy of schools. School board members talk about restructuring as a device to "open up" schools to the communities, and think tank experts hope that restructuring will make schools more socially relevant.

SBM requires a redesign of the whole school organization that goes far beyond a change in governance (Wohlstetter, 1995). Wohlstetter's (1995) three year research study in Southern California suggests that SBM requires new roles

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and responsibilities for schools. But an equally important requirement is that district and state administrators move away from telling schools what to do, and instead offer services and provide incentives for school-level change. Their findings suggest that when narrowly implemented (site-based council only), SBM is a political reform that merely shifts power from the central office to schools and is an inadequate effort to improve school performance.

Curriculum and Instruction

The school sites have always had boundless latitude over the curriculum and instruction within their schools. "Within a school-based management system, the school site has near total authority over curriculum matters. Within broad outlines defined by the board (and the state), the individual schools are free to teach in any manner they see fit" (Lindelow, 1981, p.122). School-based curriculum (Clune & White, 1988) means that each school staff decides what teaching materials are to be used, as well as the specific pedagogical techniques that are to be emphasized. It also means that the principal and teachers at the school site "determine which staff development activities best meet the needs of their particular schools" (Guthrie, 1986, p.308).

As curricula are redesigned to more appropriately address student needs, restructuring schools will require instructional methods and techniques that go beyond traditional methods of teaching which rely primarily on teacher lecture and student recitation of factual information. For example, the restructuring initiative

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

advocated by the Council of Chief State School Officers (CCSSO. 1990) focuses on strengthening higher order learning. While their recommendations involve many aspects of school structure and policy. the centerpiece targets a curriculum policy based on incorporating higher order thinking skills into all grade levels. and acknowledging different rates of development for learning.

As another example. the Curriculum Council of the National Association of Secondary School Principals endorses a concept called curriculum leadership (English & Hill. 1990). The NASSP has called for principals to take the lead in restructuring schools through developing new roles for principals and teachers. using test results in different ways to assess progress. and organizing schools for change. The desired end result is meaningful curriculum renovation.

Student assessment methods must reflect the changes in curriculum and instruction. Standardized achievement tests are warranted when standardized procedures are expected to produce standardized. desired outcomes. However. the reliance on nationally-standardized tests for information on student progress is inappropriate. when schools develop highly individualized programs for teaching and learning. Performance assessment. portfolios. and locally-gathered achievement tests are alternative forms of assessment more acceptable for evaluating a program's academic effectiveness.

Restructuring the programmatic content and pedagogical methods of school is one of the most confusing themes in the restructuring debate. Most agree that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the primary reason for restructuring schools is to improve educational effectiveness (Mitchell & Beach, 1993). Elmore (1990) proposes that the main purpose of restructuring is to transform teaching and learning. Then restructuring can be thought of as bringing the structure of classrooms and schools into conformity with the best available knowledge about teaching and learning. Reforms like the "accelerated schools" programs or "outcome-based education" are viable and appropriate strategies (Rowan, 1990). Another similar reform effort is Theodore Sizer's "Coalition of Essential Schools" (1984). Sizer's approach to restructuring effort focuses on the changing relationship between teacher and students, creating a reduced teacher case load, and increasing the density of student-teacher interactions on the personal level.

A growing emphasis on a technical model of curriculum and instruction restructuring is advanced by many authors (Rowan, 1990; Brophy & Good, 1986; Smith & O'Day, 1990) whose emphasis is consistent with the view that school restructuring is accomplished by importing the best available knowledge about teaching and learning into schools and transforming the structure of schools to correspond to that knowledge (Elmore, 1990).

Elmore's (1990) technical orientation refers to changes in curriculum and instruction. Implicit in the notion that curriculum design and instructional delivery must change is the establishment of a reconfigured learning environment. Most curriculum changes are surface-level changes, usually modifying only materials

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and instructional techniques within acceptable boundaries and often resulting in disappointing longitudinal outcomes (Joyce. 1991). In contrast. changes in curriculum accompanied by improved social dynamics. necessary staff development. cooperatively-developed understanding about innovative teaching models. and a consensus on expected results will improve a school's learning environment.

"The focus of school restructuring on the improvement of student learning may be both its major strength and its major weakness" (Elmore. 1990. p. 23). It is a strength. because student learning is presumably the central reason that schools exist. It is a weakness. because schools are expected to do many more things than promote student learning.

In restructured schools. support for curriculum and instruction often comes from parents. business and industry (Swap. 1991). Initiated in 1989. the Chicago School Reform Act transferred decision-making authority from central office administration to school councils primarily made up of parents (Bacchus & Marhiafava. 1991). Business. industry. and school systems have often joined forces to initiate and accelerate restructuring. In cases such as the Panasonic Foundation/Santa Fe (NM) Public Schools partnership. industry brings the necessary funding and external impetus which is necessary to begin the restructuring process and foster vital staff development (What is working in education: A symposium. 1990).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter Summary

This chapter reviews the literature relevant to the many aspects of school restructuring, including. the definition of restructuring. systemic change. teachers in change. the principal as a change facilitator, districts in change. and the three components of restructuring (budget/finance-fiscal responsibility, decision-making/governance. curriculum/instruction). The majority of restructuring literature to date appears prescriptive in tone. Researchers and reformers alike all have plans for successful restructuring. There are lists. guidelines. dos and don'ts. and mapped strategies guaranteed to produce restructured schools. Restructuring deals with some old themes (i.e.. organizational change, educational reform). yet it represents an effort to talk about these in a new way. As Lieberman and Miller (1990) state. "The leap from restructuring reports to realities is a difficult one" (p.762).

Specifically, research findings have identified a variety of sources from which a picture of restructuring can be developed (Murphy. 1991). In this chapter. the focus is on the various theories and research studies conducted to define and enhance school restructuring. but the method of understanding restructuring that has received perhaps the least amount of attention in the literature is the perceptions of professionals who work in schools. It is from these participants that the true picture of school restructuring is to emerge. The people in the trenches acting out the script. which has been written for them and hopefully by them.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter 3
Design and Methodology

Introduction to Data Sources and Methodologies

In studying school restructuring efforts in Louisiana, certain factors must be taken into account. First, the term "restructuring" has many meanings to many people. The rhetoric surrounding the amount and degree to which schools are restructured is not only fragmented at a national level, but also at the state and district levels. Secondly, cultural and geographical differences exist within the state. The sizes of the school systems and schools themselves, the urbanicity variable, and the configuration of grades at each school site (K-1, K-6, K-5, K-2, 3-6, 5-8, 6-8), are important factors to consider when selecting the elementary school sites to study.

A major methodological issue concerns how to identify the methods whereby successful restructuring is being implemented in Louisiana elementary schools. The primary research purposes of this study are to determine whether or not teachers at the identified "restructured schools" are aware of the restructuring and to assess the impact these innovations have on these teachers and their classrooms. Secondary purposes of the study are to identify the role of the principal as a change facilitator and to assess the amount and kind of district support involved in the restructuring effort.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

This study employs both quantitative and qualitative techniques to study the effect that the restructuring processes have, not only on the teachers in the classroom, but also on the principal as a change agent, and on the type and degree of district support for the restructuring effort. The quantitative procedures include surveys to gather the data and quantitative analysis techniques to interpret the findings. Qualitative research techniques include interviews, observations, and document analysis and utilize a systematic qualitative analysis scheme.

As explained below, this study analyzes and describes elementary schools in Louisiana that are considered "restructured" based on the definition of 'restructuring' (found in the Definition Section below) and on the Three Components of School Restructuring (Figure 1.1). In this Design and Methodology Chapter, I will first describe the overall design, followed by the identification of the sample, a description of the instruments, an abbreviated version of the procedure, a statement of the research questions, statements regarding analysis of the data, important definitions, and limitations of the study.

Design

The design of the study is multi-layered using a representative sample from all the geographical areas of the State and involves the use of mixed methods of data collection (Figure 3.1).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

	LAYER ONE
Geographic Area	66 (64 Parishes and 2 City School Systems) 8 Regional Service Centers
Level	Regional Service Center Effective Schools Program Manager
Qualitative Design	Interviews with the Effective Schools Program Managers (8)
Quantitative Design	LSDE Survey 1992 (McKenzie, Baldwin, DeVille) Three Components of Restructuring (Pol)
Resultant Population	8 Restructured Districts
	LAYER TWO
Geographic Area	8 Restructured District 8 District Representatives
Level	District/ District Representative
Qualitative Design	Interviews with the District Representatives
Quantitative Design	LSDE Survey 1992 (McKenzie, Baldwin, DeVille) Three Components of Restructuring (Pol)
Proposed Population	16 Elementary Schools (2 from each District) 8 Highly Successful Restructured 8 Moderately Successful Restructured
Resultant Population	5 Restructured Districts
	PILOT TEST
Geographic Area	Jackson District 2 Elementary Schools
Level	District Representative School Principal
Quantitative Design	Pilot Test Instrument Attributes of School Restructuring Scale (ASRS) (Pol & Taylor)
Results	Construct Validity of ASRS

Figure 3.1

Study Design for Restructuring in Louisiana Schools

(fig. con'd.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

LAYER THREE

Geographic Area	5 Restructured Districts 10 Elementary Schools (2 from each District) 5 Highly Successful Restructured 8 Moderately Successful Restructured
Level	School - Principal - Faculty
Qualitative Design	Interviews with Superintendent Interviews with Principals Interviews with Teachers Site Visits to the Schools Field Notes
Quantitative Design	The Attributes of School Restructuring Scale (Pol & Taylor) Rating Form for Qualitative Observation Field Notes
Study Sample	10 Elementary Schools (2 from each District) 5 Highly Successful Restructured 5 Moderately Successful Restructured

Quantitative Design

The quantitative design of this study involves survey research as a tool to both select a representative sample and triangulate with results from qualitative data. This study will benefit from the integration of the quantitative evidence (surveys) and the qualitative evidence (case studies) as noted by advocates of triangulation (e.g., Denzin, 1970; Jick, 1983; Patton, 1990). The same general questions are posed to a larger population of teachers in the form of surveys, and to a smaller population of teachers in case study interviews. The answers are then compared for consistency. The case study can allow for some insight into the causal processes, while the survey data can provide some indication of the degree to which the results are generalizable.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Two types of surveys were used in this study: Attributes of School Restructuring Scale (ASRS) and The Louisiana State Department of Education (LSDE) Survey 1991-92 (McKenzie, Baldwin, & DeVille, 1992) (See Appendix 1 & 2) and they were used as sources to aid in the process of identifying the most restructured districts in the State. Along with the Three Components of Restructuring (See Figure1.1), the LSDE Survey was used as confirmatory evidence of the types of restructuring occurring within the State. The ASRS was given to teachers to elicit information concerning their perceptions, feelings and degree of involvement concerning the restructuring efforts in their schools. This attitudinal survey was administered to all teachers in the sample schools.

Qualitative Design

The qualitative design of this study draws from ideas presented in Lincoln and Guba's Naturalistic Inquiry (1985), James Spradley's Participant Observation (1980), Michael Quinn Patton's Qualitative Evaluation Methods (1990), and Robert Yin's Case Study Research (1989).

The design of the study can be termed a "multiple-embedded" case study. Yin (1989) explains:

> ...any use of multiple-case designs should follow a replication. The cases should serve in a manner similar to multiple experiments, with similar results (a literal replication) or contrary results (a theoretical replication) predicted explicitly at the outset of the investigation... replication design does not necessarily mean that each case study needs to be either holistic or eembedded. The individual cases, within a multiple-case study design, may be either. When an embedded design is used, each individual case

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

> study may in fact include the collection and analysis of highly quantitative data, including the use of surveys within each case. (p. 59)

In many embedded design case studies, such as this project, surveys are conducted at each site; therefore, each site is the topic of a case study. The results of each survey are not pooled across sites, but rather the survey data is part of the findings for each individual school site. These survey data are quantitative, focusing on the attitudes and behaviors of individual clients, but the data is used only to interpret the success and operations at a particular site.

Interviews

The interview process occurs at all layers of the study (See Figure 3.1). Interviews were conducted first as part of the sampling strategy to locate the restructured elementary schools in Louisiana. A more formal format was used to gain information about the restructuring efforts in the second and third phase of interviews conducted with district representatives, principals, and teachers.

The interviews took several forms. All of the interviews with participants were of an open-ended nature, in which the respondents were asked for facts as well as opinions about the restructuring effort. Even though the focused interviews: District Representative/ Superintendent Restructuring Interview Protocol (Appendix 3) and Principal Restructuring Interview Protocol (Appendix 4) follow a protocol, the questions remained relatively open-ended in nature.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Observations

The elementary schools were visited to create the opportunity for direct observation. The field observations consisted of casual data collection activities and coincided with the interviews of the principal and the teachers. While interviews follow a protocol making them formal. the data collected from the observation is more informal. The observations of the schools add another dimension for understanding the context of the restructuring effort.

The observations follow the general outline of those described by Spradley (1979): descriptive observation. focused observations. and selective observations. As the site visits occurred. descriptive observations were most common at first. followed by focused observations and selective observations as areas of interest regarding restructuring are clearly delineated.

Documents

Archival records and documents were collected to serve as another data source. Archival sources can produce both quantitative and qualitative information. Examples of documents and archival records used in this study are: restructuring project proposals. interim reports. correspondence. agendas. and summaries of committee meetings. This information provided an independent source of data and description of school programs and background information

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

on both the districts and the individual schools. These data may be considered the "ideal" description of the restructuring efforts.

Triangulation of methods, as well as data sources, improve the probability that the findings and interpretations from this study are credible. Using information from the LSDE survey, observations, documents, and multiple interviews, data was cross-checked and triangulated for accuracy and validation purposes.

Sample

The final study sample was based on a three level stratification scheme described in Figure 3.1. Purposeful sampling was used in this study because the design calls for in-depth descriptions of modal instances of highly and moderately successful restructuring efforts at diverse locales. Lincoln and Guba (1985) recommend purposive sampling as a naturalistic sampling technique because it is based on informational (not statistical) considerations, and its purpose is to maximize information, not facilitate generalization. For the purpose of sampling, the 66 Louisiana districts (64 parishes and two city school systems) were stratified according to the existing eight State Board of Elementary and Secondary Education (SBESE) regions. A Regional Service Center is located in each of these areas and houses a director and an Effective School Program Manager.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Eight school districts, one from each Regional Service Center area, were selected based on information elicited from qualitative open-ended interviews of the eight Effective Schools Program Managers in those regions. The eight school districts chosen by this method were then visited and an interview (Appendix 3) was conducted with a selected district representative, following the general interview guide approach (Patton, 1990) with pre-determined categories of topics.

It was anticipated that the eight districts chosen would suggest two schools from their system that met the criteria for selection. Three of the eight districts were unable to identify schools that they felt were restructured based on the guidelines. These three districts were eliminated from the study at this point. The interviews from the five remaining districts led to the identification of two elementary schools from each participating district. Consideration was given in selecting the schools to the results of the LSDE Survey (Appendix 2) indicating the types of restructuring efforts within the Louisiana schools in 1992-93.

The two elementary schools selected from each of the eight districts were chosen to represent a highly successful restructured school and a moderately successful restructured school. A total of 10 schools (5 pairs) constituted the total population from which the final case studies were selected. The final selection of the case study schools was accomplished by triangulating data from the surveys, observations, and interviews. The selection was also sensitive to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

considerations that it constitute a geographically representative sample of Louisiana schools. Not only was there an effort to select a district from each part of the state, but there was also an effort to choose districts that were representative of urban, rural, large, small, affluent, and non-affluent districts.

In any study in which schools are selected on the basis of reputation, the researchers have to depend upon the opinions of "experts" in selecting their sample. It could be that there were some districts or schools in the state that were more restructured than the ones chosen for this project, but I followed the methodology as had been established. This issue will also be addressed later on in Chapter 6.

Instrumentation

This instrumentation section follows a chronological order, describing both qualitative and quantitative instruments within the progressive layers (Regional, District, School) of the design. (See Figure 3.1) This section presents an overview of the data collection instruments.

The McKenzie, Baldwin and DeVille (1992) LSDE Survey

The Louisiana State Department of Education sponsored an attempt to locate successfully restructured schools during the 1991-92 school year and research was conducted by Applied Technology Research Corporation (McKenzie, Baldwin, & DeVille, 1992). The primary purposes of the project were twofold: (1) to provide the LDE with a mechanism to examine the concepts

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of restructuring schools, and to (2) aid in determining the Department's leadership role in supporting and assisting local restructuring efforts. The study also attempted to identify successful efforts in Louisiana which could be utilized as models for programmatic change.

The survey instrument (Appendix 1) consisted of two parts: (1) the first part asked the respondent to check yes or no if their school system had any programs which fell under the fifteen school restructuring categories (i.e., fiscal restructuring, site-based management, school incentive programs); and (2) the second part asked the respondent to identify efforts in their school system that merited special recognition due to their success or innovation.

The Three Components of Restructuring

The Three Components of Restructuring (Figure 1.1) was utilized in selecting the eight successfully restructured districts. While not a data gathering instrument itself, the Three Components of Restructuring were presented to the Effective School Program Managers in a meeting in which they were asked to select the most successfully restructured district in their region. Thus the Three Components of Restructuring served as a criteria for selection of these districts.

In addition, the district level respondents were asked to choose a highly successful and moderately successful restructured school based on the Three Components of Restructuring (Budget/Finance-Fiscal Responsibility, Decision-Making/Governance, Curriculum/Instruction) and to include a brief description

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of the program, the school, and a contact person at each site.

The Attributes of School Restructuring Scale (Pol & Taylor, 1994)

The Attributes of School Restructuring Scale ASRS (Appendix 1) measures teachers' knowledge about their particular school's restructuring efforts and the teachers' degree of involvement in the restructuring projects. The survey questions were designed in a closed-ended format so that quantification and analysis of the results could be carried out efficiently. The ASRS consists of two parts: (a) Part One, which identified the restructuring efforts and the pervasiveness of the effort and (b) Part Two, which measured the degree of teacher's involvement with the restructuring efforts.

Teacher Participation in Decision Making developed by Bacharach, Bauer, and Shedd (1986) served as a guide for the ASRS (Pol & Taylor, 1994). Taylor used the Bacharach scale and other surveys as part of her dissertation on restructuring. After an exhaustive literature search to find a survey more suitable for this study, we (Pol & Taylor, 1994) decided to use the structure and format of the Teacher Participation in Decision Making to construct the ASRS. Some items included in the ASRS are directly linked to the categories listed in the Three Components of School Restructuring. Many of the items included in the ASRS were taken directly from the Bacharach survey and are also part of the Three Components of School Restructuring. It was necessary to reword the categories to express the intent of the survey.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Part One of the (ASRS) is designed to identify the school restructuring efforts within a school and the extent to which that effort is perceived by the teachers in the school. The questions were developed and constructed based on the Three Components of Restructuring (Pol & Taylor, 1994), using the guidelines set forth in Borg and Gall (1989) for survey construction. Questions were developed for each of the categories of school restructuring found in the Three Components of School Restructuring. Part One of the instrument consisted of twenty-four items which are rated on a three-point Likert scale from a great deal, some, to none at all. An example of the items on this scale include, "How much control does your school have over setting budget priorities?" The teachers' knowledge of their particular school's restructuring effort and the pervasiveness of the effort were elicited from this section of the survey.

A parallel form of each of these questions appeared in Part Two of the instrument, which consists of twenty-four items rated on the same three-point Likert scale noted above. The parallel form of the previous example question was, "To what degree are you involved in the way the school sets the budget priorities?" The teachers' assessment of their own involvement in the restructuring effort were elicited from this section of the survey.

The measurement integrity of the survey instrument (validity and reliability) was established by field testing the instrument and analyzing data

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

gathered. The reliability was established after the survey results were obtained and analyzed from the other schools in the study. According to Popham (1988). reliability refers to the consistency with which an instrument assesses whatever it is measuring and validity refers to the defensibility of inferences made from survey instrument. Popham also states that "reliability is a necessary but not sufficient condition for a test's validity" (pp. 119-122).

Construct validity is defined by Borg and Gall (1989) as the "extent to which a particular test can be shown to measure a hypothetical construct. that is. "a theoretical construction about the nature of human behavior" (p.255). Popham (1988) states that in a construct-validation approach. evidence is gathered regarding both the construct theory and potential inference to be based on survey results. Psychological concepts (e.g.. intelligence. anxiety. creativity) are considered hypothetical constructs because they are not directly observable but rather are inferred on the basis of their observable effects on behavior.

In order to gather evidence on construct validity. the survey was field tested in the two selected schools in Jackson District. Reputational criteria. obtained from the region's (Effective Schools Program Manager) was employed to select a highly successful and a moderately successful restructured elementary school in Jackson. The survey was then given to all the teachers in each of these schools.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Borg and Gall (1989) suggest that one method for gathering evidence on construct validity involves the developer of the survey setting up hypotheses about the characteristics of persons who should obtain high scores on the measure as opposed to those who should obtain low scores. Since the ASRS is designed to determine how successfully schools are restructured, then the test should differentiate between highly successful and moderately successful restructured schools. If the test does, in fact, differentiate the two groups, then there is some empirical evidence that it measures the construct of successful school restructuring.

Results of the Construct Validation of the ASRS

Tables 3.1 through 3.3 present the results of the construct validation of the ASRS conducted during the Fall 1994 semester at two schools in the Jackson school system (one highly restructured and one moderately restructured). ANOVAs and MANOVAs were run to compare the differences in means among the two schools and to compare the difference in means between the three components of restructuring.

Table 3.1 contains data that compares the two schools on the items measuring the Budget/Finance components, both at the school level and at the personal level. Six of the eight comparisons were significantly different from one another, such that teachers in the highly restructured school gave overall

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

higher restructuring scores to their school than did teachers in the moderately restructured school.

Table 3.1

Comparison of Mean Scores for Items Measuring the Budget/Finance Component of Restructuring

ITEM	Highly Restructured School (HRS)	Moderately Restructured School (MRS)	F Value	Significance Level
Setting Budget Priorities(S)	2.81	2.46	4.54	p>.05
Setting Budget Priorities(P)	2.03	1.62	3.34	n.s.
Hiring Staff(S)	2.94	2.68	8.29	p>.01
Hiring Staff (P)	2.46	1.11	80.95	p>.0001
Finding Alternative Sources of Funds(S)	2.97	2.81	4.53	n.s.
Finding Alternative Sources of Funds(P)	2.35	1.69	14.74	p>.001
Deciding How School Funds are Spent(S)	3.00	2.34	12.21	p>.001
Deciding How School Funds are Spent (P)	2.65	1.38	42.54	p>.0001

Notes. School (S) refers to the degree of responsibility the school has for the components os restructuring.

Personal (P) refers to the degree of involvement the teacher has for the components of restructuring.

A score of "3" indicates the school is highly restructured. while a score of "1" indicates it is not. The means in this table are based on 35 responses from the highly restructured school and 29 responses from the moderately restructured school.

Table 3.2 contains data that compares the two schools on the items measuring the Governance/Decision-Making components. both at the school

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

level and at the personal level. Seven of the ten comparisons were significantly different from one another. such that teachers in the highly restructured school gave overall higher restructuring scores to their school than did teachers in the moderately restructured school.

Table 3.2

Comparison of Mean Scores for Items Measuring the Governance/Decision-Making Component of Restructuring

ITEM	Highly Restructured School (HRS)	Moderately Restructured School (MRS)	F Value	Significance Level
Deciding Faculty Assignments(S)	2.80	2.00	.06	n.s
Deciding Faculty Assignments(P)	2.77	1.35	17.19	p>.0001
Establishing School Governance (S)	2.97	2.21	2.78	n.s
Establishing School Governance (P)	2.82	1.88	4.18	p>.05
Promoting Decision Making (S)	2.85	2.35	2.79	n.s
Promoting Decision Making (P)	2.65	1.88	10.18	p>.01
Involving Parents (S)	3.00	2.77	8.85	p>.01
Involving Parents (P)	2.80	2.24	17.84	p>.0001
Involving Community (S)	2.94	2.26	10.27	p>.01
Involving Community (P)	2.64	1.89	5.39	p>.05

Note. Same as Table 3.1.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 3.3

Comparison of Mean Scores for Items Measuring the Curriculum/Instruction Component of Restructuring

ITEM	Highly Restructured School(HRS)	Moderately Restructured School(MRS)	F Value	Significance Level
Arranging the SchoolWeeklySchedule(S)	2.82	2.81	0.01	n.s
Arranging the SchoolWeeklySchedule(P)	2.81	1.63	5.65	p>.05
Arranging the School Yearly Schedule(S)	2.53	2.72	1.27	n.s
Arranging the School YearlySchedule(P)	1.85	1.44	6.24	p>.05
Arranging the Student Daily Schedule (S)	2.83	2.68	1.63	n.s.
Arranging the Student Daily Schedule(P)	2.54	2	9.11	p>.0037
Arranging the Teacher Daily Schedule(S)	3	2.72	3.37	n.s.
Arranging the Teacher DailySchedlue(P)	2.91	2	11.6	p>.0011
Implementing New Roles (S)	2.91	2.62	6.89	p>.05
Implementing New Roles (P)	2.32	1.65	15.1	p>.0003
Creating Special Programs (S)	2.97	2.79	5.54	p>.05
Creating Special Programs (P)	2.35	1.64	16.5	p>.0001
Determining the Curriculum (S)	2.45	2.62	1.32	n.s.
Determining the Curriculum (P)	2.32	2.00	4.31	p>.05
Selecting Professional Development (S)	2.88	2.67	4.33	p>.05
Selecting Professional Development (P)	2.44	2.15	3.85	p>.05

(table con'd.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ITEM	Highly Restructured School(HRS)	Moderately Restructured School(MRS)	F Value	Significance Level
Developing Parent Programs (S)	2.88	2.68	1.34	n.s.
Developing Parent Programs (P)	2.33	1.79	11.1	p>.001
Designing Ways to Teach (S)	2.76	2.22	11.9	p>.001
Designing Ways to Teach (P)	2.45	2.11	3.09	n.s.
Organizing Students for Learning(S)	2.85	2.79	0.31	n.s.
Organizing Students for Learning(P)	2.53	1.86	13.3	p>.0005
Establishing Student Discipline (S)	2.86	2.9	0.22	n.s.
Establishing Student Discipline (P)	2.46	2.31	0.73	n.s.
Establishing Outcomes for Students(S)	2.76	2.71	0.2	n.s.
Establishing Outcomes for Students(P)	2.5	2.32	1.43	n.s.
Creating Climate/Culture (S)	2.83	2.64	2.13	n.s.
Creating Climate/Culture (P)	2.8	2.61	2.17	n.s.
Determining Assessment (S)	2.79	2.7	0.55	n.s.
Determining Assessment (P)	2.61	2.33	3.22	n.s.

Note. Same as Table 3.1.

Table 3.3 compares the two schools on the items measuring the Curriculum/Instruction components, both at the school level and at the personal

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

level. Nineteen of the thirty comparisons were significantly different from one another, such that teachers in the highly restructured school gave overall higher restructuring scores to their school than did teachers in the moderately restructured school.

The data from this pilot project provides strong evidence that the ASRS has construct validity. The instrument significantly differentiated a highly successful restructured school and a moderately restructured school on 32 of the 48 ASRS items.

In the next chapter, I will present a more complete validation of the ASRS. Since the number on the instrument is a bit complicated, Table 3.4 contains a list of the items grouped under the three components of restructuring. This table should be referred to when reading Chapter 4.

Teacher Perceptions of Restructuring Interview Protocol (Pol, 1994)

A structured interview protocol Teacher Perceptions of Restructuring Protocol (Appendix 5) was developed for use in this study based on a semi-structured interview protocol, Teacher Participation in Restructuring Questionnaire, originally developed to assess teachers' perceptions of restructuring (Murphy et al, 1991). The original instrument constructed by Murphy and others, consisted of 22 open-ended questions based on previous

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 3.4

ASRS Items Grouped by the Components of Restructuring

Budget/Finance Component	
B1	Setting Budget Priorities/School
B2	Setting Budget Priorities/Personal
B3	Hiring Staff/School
B4	Hiring Staff/Personal
B7	Deciding Faculty Assignments/School
B8	Deciding Faculty Assignments/Personal
B9	Deciding How School Funds are Spent/School
B10	Deciding How School Funds are Spent/Per nal
Governance/Decision-Making Component	
G5	Deciding Faculty Assignments/School
G6	Deciding Faculty Assignments/Personal
G11	Establishing School Governance Procedures (School councils, etc.)/School
G12	Establishing School Governance Procedures (School councils, etc.)/Personal
G13	Promoting School Wide Decision-Making/School
G14	Promoting School Wide Decision-Making/Personal
G15	Involving Parents in the School/School
G16	Involving Parents in the School/Personal
G17	Involving Community /Industry in the School/School
G18	Involving Community /Industry in the School/Personal

(table con'd.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Curriculum/Instruction Component	
C19	Arranging the School Weekly Schedule/School
C20	Arranging the School Weekly Schedule/Personal
C21	Arranging the School Yearly Schedule/School
C22	Arranging the School Yearly Schedule/Personal
C23	Arranging the Student Daily Schedule/School
C24	Arranging the Student Daily Schedule/Personal
C25	Arranging the Teacher Daily Schedule/School
C26	Arranging the Teacher Daily Schedule/Personal
C27	Implementing New Roles for Teachers (Mentor. Coach. etc.)/School
C28	Implementing New Roles for Teachers (Mentor. Coach. etc.)/Personal
C29	Creating Special Programs (Computer. Science Programs. etc.)/School
C30	Creating Special Programs (Computer. Science Programs. etc.)/Personal
C31	Determining the Curriculum/School
C32	Determining the Curriculum/Personal
C33	Selecting Professional Development/School
C34	Selecting Professional Development/Personal
C35	Developing Parent Programs/School
C36	Developing Parent Programs/Personal
C37	Designing Ways Teachers Teach/School
C38	Designing Ways Teachers Teach/Personal
C39	Organizing Students for Learning(Grade. Class. etc.)/School
C40	Organizing Students for Learning(Grade. Class. etc.)/Personal

(table con'd.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Curriculum/Instruction Component	
C41	Establishing Student Discipline Procedures/School
C42	Establishing Student Discipline Procedures/Personal
C43	Establishing Outcomes for Students/School
C44	Establishing Outcomes for Students/Personal
C45	Creating Climate/Culture of the Classroom/School
C46	Creating Climate/Culture of the Classroom/Personal
C47	Determining Assessment Practices/School
C48	Determining Assessment Practices/Personal

Note. Item prefix "B" refers to Budget/Finance. "G' refers to Governance/Decision-Making. and "C" refers to Curriculum/Instruction.

studies and literature reviews concerning ways of understanding restructuring. The basic interview was modified to include some of the Three Components of Restructuring and the Attributes of School Restructuring Scale that were not included in the original interview protocol developed by Murphy and others.

The framework of the structured interview protocol (Goetz & LeCompte. 1984) was intended to guide the teachers to first think of restructuring in the most general terms (e.g.. to collect their thoughts on who would be affected. what broad changes would occur. what general school changes and classroom changes would they expect) and then to focus on specific changes at the school and classroom levels. Redundancy was a deliberate feature of the interview protocol: questions were to be asked that involve the teachers views on restructuring and their involvement with restructuring. Similar issues at multiple levels (school

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and classroom) were addressed to learn how teachers view teaching-learning themes at different levels of restructuring involvement.

The teachers were asked to address a series of open-ended, non-cued questions regarding their general feelings about restructuring, their beliefs about whom they thought might be affected, and their thought about the changes that would have to take place both in education in general and in their specific schools in order for restructuring to occur. More specific topics were then addressed to gather teachers' perceptions about their involvement in restructuring change at both the classroom and the school levels: the teaching-learning process in general, teachers' relationships with students, culture/climate, budget, curriculum, professional development, schedules, expenditures of time, specific teaching practices, organization of students for learning, management of student behavior, outcomes for students, students' interactions with teachers.

The Classroom Observation Instrument (COI)

A modified version of the COI (Appendix 6) was used in this study. The original COI was developed for the Louisiana School Effectiveness Study Part III (LSES-III) to provide higher-inference classroom data (Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). The COI was based on the teaching functions identified in Rosenshine's (1983) synthesis of teacher effectiveness research. Fifteen general indicators, each with specific cues, were used to guide qualitative data collection. For example, specific cues associated with "initial student practice," included: high

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

frequency of questions. teacher directed exchange. teacher prompts. opportunity for all students to respond. and success rate of 80% during initial learning.

Procedures

Introduction

The following procedure section describes more specifically the types of activities that occurred at each of the three levels of the study found in Figure 3.1 This section also describes the evolution of the methodology and the techniques employed to elicit information from the various sources available.

Layer One

As noted above. eight districts were chosen based on the interviews and consultations with the Regional Service Center Directors. the Effective Schools Program Director. and the results of the State Department of Education Survey (McKenzie. Baldwin. & DeVille. 1992). The interviews and selection of the school sample followed the interviewing techniques of Spradley (1979) and Patton (1990).

There are three basic approaches to collecting qualitative data through open-ended interviews. The three approaches. as described by Patton (1990). involve different types of preparation. conceptualization. and instrumentation. Each approach has strengths and weaknesses. and each serves a somewhat different purpose. The three choices are: 1) the informal conversation: 2) the general interview guide approach: and 3) the standardized open-ended interview.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The Patton typology of types of interviews is similar to Spradley's (1979) questioning sequence. Spradley encourages ethnographic interviewers to follow his Developmental Research Sequence, which also incorporates three basic kinds of questions: descriptive, structural and contrast questions. Descriptive questions are used when the researcher has little knowledge about the social situation, and are intended to encourage an informant to talk freely about a particular cultural scene. There are five forms of the descriptive questions that can be used to elicit descriptive information: grand tour questions, mini-tour questions, example questions, experience questions, and native-language questions. The sample selection process involves starting with a "grand tour question" which is a concept that originated from the common experience of having someone show you around their house.

The beginning of the search for restructured schools in this study started with an informal conversation approach, asking the "grand tour question" of the Effective Schools Program Managers: "What District in your Regional Service Center area is the most restructured using the definitions from Three Components of School Restructuring?"

As the social scene becomes more defined, structural and contrast questions are used to gain more in-depth insight into the phenomena. Spradley (1979) cautions that "although the Developmental Research Sequence goes from

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

descriptive questions to structural questions to contrast questions, the ethnographer never proceeds from descriptive to structural to contrast interviews" (p.121). Descriptive, structural and contrast questions should be a part of every interview.

Structural questions function to explore the organization of an informant's cultural knowledge. These structural questions help not only to find out what people know, but how they have organized that knowledge. Structural questions "must be repeated many times to elicit and exhaust all the knowledge the informant has on the subject" (Spradley, 1979, p.121). One reason for asking structural questions concurrently with descriptive questions is to reduce the boredom and tediousness that comes with constant repetition.

Contrast questions are based on differences and similarities. These questions are based on the contrast principle: that is, "how are things the same or how are things different." There are various levels of contrast questions which involve two, three, or more items of contrast.

Layer Two

A District Representative was chosen based on the interview with the Effective Schools Program Managers, as the authority in the district with the most knowledge of the restructuring efforts. The district representative interview (Appendix 3) consisted of structured and contrast questions (Spradley, 1979) on specific topics concerning the district restructuring philosophy, policy, and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

support initiatives. Three of the eight interviews yielded information that eliminated these districts from the study. The district representatives felt that their district did not fall into the category of "restructured" based on the selection tools for this study. Based on this interview two schools were chosen from the five participating Districts that exemplify the most extensive and successfully restructured elementary school and a less extensive and moderately successfully restructured elementary school using The Three Components of Restructuring as the selection tool.

Layer Three

Superintendents of the five school districts were contacted via letter to request the participation of their schools. Attached to the letter was a brief, general summary of the Attributes of School Restructuring Scale. The principals were made aware of the survey, its purpose and the administration procedures during the principal interview. Each principal helped to determine the best method for their school in terms of how the surveys were distributed and collected.

The superintendent interview (Appendix 3) and the principal interview (Appendix 4) utilized both the general interview guide and the informal conversation approach. It is important to have a predetermined set of issues that need to be explored in the course of the interview. The advantages of this interview guide format are twofold: (1) it makes sure that the limited time

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

available in an interview is be best utilized. and (2) it makes interviewing across a number of different people as systematic and comprehensive as possible. The informal conversation interviews were conducted during the school site visitations. In addition confirmatory or exploratory informal interviews were conducted with the principal when the need to find out seemed appropriate.

Interviews were conducted with all superintendents/principals of the selected district/elementary schools. As noted above. in order to understand the involvement of the principal/superintendent in the restructuring process a structured interview protocol was developed to gather the same data from each of the superintendents/principals. These questions followed a general outline that included: 1) history of the school/system and the restructuring programs; 2) background of the principal/superintendent in relationship to the school/system and change: 3) district support and the relationship to the central office: 4) the initiation and implementation process of the restructuring effort; and 5) the elements of the restructuring programs.

Site visits were conducted at each school in order to observe the restructuring effort in progress and collect ethnographic data about each school site. A representative sample (two from each grade level) of classrooms were observed in all grades except Pre-Kindergarten and Kindergarten classes. The principals were asked to select. across grades. teachers with varying degrees of experience to be observed and interviewed. Field notes were taken and the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Classroom Observation Instrument (Appendix 6) was used in order to impose consistency on the type of activities and characteristics during the classroom and school visits. The observed classroom teachers were interviewed using the Teacher Perceptions of Restructuring Protocol (Appendix 5) which incorporates both the general interview guide approach and the informal conversation at all school sites. All teachers were given the Attributes of School Restructuring Scale.

The ASRS was administered through a combination of personal contacts and correspondence. The researcher traveled to each of the school districts and schools and spent two to three days in each of these sites. During those days, the instrument was administered in an individual setting. If there were teachers who felt uncomfortable or hesitant completing the ASRS at the time of the on-site visit, stamped and addressed envelope to return the instrument to the researcher was given. For any non-respondents, a letter was sent requesting completion of the instruments.

Lincoln and Guba (1985) define trustworthiness as a dimension of perceived methodological rigor. For better or worse, the trustworthiness of the data is tied directly to the trustworthiness of the researcher who collects and analyzes the data. After returning to the data over and over again, I felt incumbent to return to the schools and districts in the study to confirm suppositions and feelings that I had experienced the school year before. The

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

districts and schools were revisited in order to validate perceptions and confirm suppositions and to allay my anxiousness concerning "getting it right".

Research Questions (Revisited)

The research questions are revisited in this section in order to present the qualitative and quantitative data that will answer them. These data sources were described in earlier sections of this chapter.

1. "What districts in the state are successfully restructured based on the Three Components of Restructuring/Categories?"

LAYER ONE

- **Survey** LDE Survey 1992 and Three Components of Restructuring
- **Interview** Effective Schools Program Managers
  District Representatives

2. " Can schools be categorized according to the extent to which restructuring has occurred in each of the areas: (a) Budget/Finance-Fiscal Responsibility, (b) Decision-Making/Governance, and (c) Curriculum and Instruction?"

LAYER ONE

- **Survey** LDE Survey 1992 and Three Components of Restructuring
- **Interview** Effective Schools Program Managers
  District Representatives

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

LAYER TWO AND LAYER THREE

- **Interview** District Representatives, Superintendent, Principals, and Teachers
- **Survey** Attributes of School Restructuring Survey (ASRS)

3. "What is the nature of teacher and student work activities in schools that are highly restructured and moderately restructured?"

LAYER THREE

- **Interview** Superintendent, Principals, and Teachers
- **Site Visits** Classroom Observation Instrument

4. "How much district support is given to the selected elementary schools?"

LAYER TWO AND LAYER THREE

- **Interview** District Representatives, Superintendent, Principals, and Teachers

5. "Are these restructuring efforts evident and successful to the teachers within the schools?"

LAYER THREE

- **Survey** Attributes of School Restructuring Survey (ASRS)
- **Interview** Teachers

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

6. "What is the role of the principal in these restructuring efforts within their school?"

LAYER THREE

- **Interview** Superintendent. District Representatives. Principals. and Teachers

7. "What is the history of the district and school with regard to supporting and sustaining reform efforts like restructuring ?"

LAYER TWO AND LAYER THREE

- **Interview** Superintendent. District Representatives. and Principals

8. "Where did the impetus come from for the restructuring effort?"

LAYER TWO AND LAYER THREE

- **Interview** Superintendent. District Representatives. Principals. and Teachers

9. "What changes in classroom instruction and learning has occurred as a result of school restructuring efforts?"

LAYER THREE

- **Interview** Superintendent. District Representatives. Principals. and Teachers

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Data Analysis

The data analysis utilized a twofold approach. First, quantitative analysis was conducted on the ASRS surveys completed by the teachers. Then, qualitative analyses were conducted on the interviews and observations. These qualitative analyses were conducted to provide an overall picture of the districts and school pairs.

Quantitative Analysis

Multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVAs) is a statistical technique for determining whether several groups differ on more than one dependent variable (Borg & Gall, 1989). MANOVAs were conducted for responses to each of the sets of variables: school responsibility for Budget/Finance items, for Governance/ Decision-Making items, for Curriculum/Instruction items; teacher involvement in Budget/Finance items, for Governance/Decision-Making items, for Curriculum/Instruction items on the ASRS.

MANOVAs (at the component level) and then ANOVAs (at the attribute level) were conducted. If the MANOVAs were significant, indicating an overall effect across all the items in the set, then individual univariate analyses of variance (ANOVAs) for particular items were conducted. It is important to remember the unit of analysis for this study is the teacher because of the small number of schools involved.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Qualitative Analysis

Site visits, classroom observations, and interviews with district superintendents, principals, and teacher serve as the qualitative data for the two in-depth case studies and the eight vignettes describing the five restructured districts and the five school pairs within them. A case study is an "an empirical inquiry that investigates a contemporary phenomenon within its real-life context: when the boundaries between phenomenon and context are not clearly evident, and in which multiple sources of evidence are used" (Yin, 1989, p. 23). This definition provides a framework within which case study research for this study was conducted. The present investigation of restructured Louisiana elementary schools is a multiple case design, involving a five school-pair design (5 highly successful restructured and 5 moderately successful restructured).

This study employs a variety of techniques and sources of data collection. In all ten cases, an embedded design was used because surveys were administered at each site. The results of the survey was not pooled across schools, rather the survey data is part of the findings for each individual school or case. The interview questions were analyzed across superintendent, principal, and teachers to form a portrait of the schools. These data focused on the attitudes and behaviors of the participants and were used to interpret the successful restructuring at each school. The classroom observations, field notes,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and site visit impressions of the district schools provided other sources of qualitative data for analysis.

For my analysis of the qualitative data, I utilized the constant comparative method discussed by Lincoln and Guba (1985). The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis permits the emergence of themes across the different data sources. The first step in the process is unitizing the data into smaller and more manageable segments. The emerging themes are constantly narrowed to form categories of information. This technique reduces the extensive data into topics that form the unifying criteria for the qualitative portion of the study.

Two cross-site analyses were conducted in order to detect patterns in the data from the different cases. The first cross-site analysis involved the qualitative and quantitative data from the first pair of schools, and this analysis was between the two schools. The second cross-site analysis involved the qualitative and quantitative data from all of the five school pairs, and was conducted across all of the pairs in the study. In an effort to reduce the data, two summary tables were developed to provide a focus for the two comparisons.

The case studies are descriptive as well as explanatory in nature. The studies pose competing explanations of the same set of events (change process) and indicate how such explanations may apply to other situations.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Definitions

For the sake of clarity, terms used in this study are operationally defined as follows:

School Restructuring

School restructuring is a specific type of change. Restructuring, unlike reform and renewal, implies total change. It is systemic and comprehensive and focuses on overhauling or transforming the fundamental purposes of school and the basic structure and process for achieving them (Moorman & Egemier, 1989). Restructuring implies fundamental change in the rules, roles, and relationships among communities, schools, districts, and states (Corbett, 1990). Teachers and principals in schools have the ultimate responsibility for initiating and implementing restructuring with district support. The fate of restructuring depends greatly upon what restructuring means to principals and teachers (Archbald, 1993). There can be no one ideal model of a restructured school. Each school is a part of a community that must change based on its needs.

Highly Successful Restructured School

A highly successful restructured school in this study was one which by reputation and perceptual criteria is considered extensively "restructured" based on the definition of "'restructuring" (found in the Definition Section above) and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

on the Three Components of School Restructuring: Budget/Finance, Governance/ Decision-Making, and Curriculum/Instruction (Figure 1.1).

Moderately Successful Restructured School

A moderately successful restructured school in this study was one which by reputation and perceptual criteria is considered "restructured" to a lesser degree when compared to the highly restructured school identified for the study. The guidelines for the moderately restructured school are also based on the definition of 'restructuring' (found in the Definition Section above) and on the Three Components of School Restructuring: Budget/Finance, Governance/Decision-Making, and Curriculum/Instruction (Figure 1.1).

Organizational Structures

Organizational structures can be defined as the roles, rules, and relationships (legal, political, economic, and social) that influence how people work and interact in an organization. School and district plans may include activities in more than one level and category, and some activities may overlap with others (Newmann, 1993).

CBAM Concerns-Based Adoption Model

Originally proposed in 1973 (Hall, Wallace & Dossett) this model emphasizes change as a process, and it includes a set of dimensions for describing the personal side of change. The Stages of Concern Survey and the role of the Change Facilitator are part of the larger Concerns-Based Adoption

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Model. There are several basic premises underlying the CBAM. These include: (1) change is a process, not an event; (2) the understanding of the change process in organizations requires an understanding of what happens to individuals as they are involved in change; (3) for the individual, change is a highly personal experience; (4) for the individual, change entails developmental growth in terms of feelings about and skill in using the innovations; (5) information about the change process collected on an ongoing basis can be used to facilitate the management and implementation of the change process (Heck, Stiegelbauer, Hall, & Loucks, 1988).

Change Facilitators

Change Facilitators, according to Hall and Hord (1987) can be principals, teachers, district personnel, intermediate and higher education personnel, and others who, for brief or extended periods, assist various individuals and groups in developing the competence and confidence needed to use a particular innovation. Change facilitators are responsible for using informal and systematic ways to probe individuals and groups to understand them.

District Support

District support is also an important element in the success or failure of restructuring efforts. Central office and school board support is essential in some form for change to take place at the school level. Districts must be committed to high quality teaching and learning, and they demonstrate this by allowing schools

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to alter the traditional organizational structures at the school site level. Whether initiatives come directly from above (federal/state) or below (school site): the district must be aware of the restructuring efforts since district approval and support is necessary to ensure success. In the case of the Budget/Finance component of the study, the district must allow the schools to have control over the fiscal management. School are not traditionally able to operate without district support.

Concluding Remarks

This chapter has outlined the methods to be followed in this study in identifying restructuring efforts in successful and moderately successful elementary schools in Louisiana. The study employs a combination of quantitative and qualitative methodologies to enhance our understanding of restructuring through triangulation of data produced by different sources. Interviews with district representatives, principals, and teachers, site visits, teacher questionnaires, and state-wide surveys provide data for the analysis.

In addition to the triangulation of multiple sources, the related issue of stability and consistency is addressed in this study by using multiple criteria (survey-interview, guide-survey, interview-interview) to increase the reliability of the information. Confirmational surveys, an interactive method of data collection categorized by Goetz and LeCompte (1984), were used repeatedly throughout the study to verify the applicability to the general population of key-informant data

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and other similar data. Reputational criteria and perceptual criteria were used throughout the study to check and cross-check information provided through various sources.

Delimitations and Limitations of the Study

There are three major limitations to the methodology being used. First, the small sample size, the geographic confines of the study, the limited number of interviews conducted, the lack of match among schools in terms of size, socio-economic status, and ethnic composition are of concern. The restriction of the study to elementary schools limits the generalizability of the findings of this study, especially to other parts of the country and to other levels of schooling.

Second, the nature of case study methodology poses some problems. Case studies allow the researcher to make only analytical, rather than inferential, generalizations by linking particular events to a broader theory (Yin, 1989). If the cases had been drawn from a larger sample size, it would have been possible to make statistical generalizations to corroborate the case study findings.

A third limitation arises from the nature of qualitative research which presents significant problems in maintaining reliability and validity (dependability and trustworthiness, Lincoln and Guba, 1985), because it depends heavily on the interviewing, observational, and interpretive skills of the researcher.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter 4
Quantitative Results

This chapter presents the quantitative analyses of the teacher questionnaires used to gather teacher perceptions of the restructuring efforts. Quantitative analyses of the teacher survey data was necessary to answer the second and fifth research questions: 1) "Can schools be categorized according to the extent to which restructuring has occurred in each of the areas: (a) Budget/Finance-Fiscal Responsibility, (b) Decision-Making/Governance, and (c) Curriculum/ Instruction?" and 2) "Are these restructuring efforts evident and important to the teachers within the schools?" The analyses in this chapter will be presented as the Results of the Statewide Study.

Results of the Statewide Study

In this study, ten schools (five pairs of highly and moderately restructured schools) from five geographical regions of a state were sampled based on reputational criteria similar to that used in the pilot study. All teachers in the schools were administered the ASRS. There were 130 respondents at the five highly restructured elementary schools and 110 respondents at the five moderately restructured elementary schools. MANOVAs (at the component level) and then ANOVAs (at the attribute level) were conducted. It is important to remember the unit of analysis for this study is the teacher because of the small number of schools involved (10).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Quantitative Study Results

The findings in this section are organized into two sections (1) the overall results of the MANOVAs and ANOVAs and (2) the results in relationship to the three components of restructuring that represent the major areas of inquiry: budget/finance, governance/decision-making, and curriculum/instruction. Multivariate analyses of variance (MANOVAs) were conducted for responses to each of the sets of variables: school responsibility for budget/finance items, for governance/decision-making items, for curriculum/instruction items: teacher involvement in budget/finance items, for governance/decision-making items, for curriculum/instruction items. If the MANOVAs were significant, indicating an overall effect across all the items in the set, then individual univariate analyses of variance results (ANOVAs) for particular items were reported.

Results of the MANOVAs and ANOVAs

Table 4.1a presents the summary results of the MANOVAs comparing the means for the highly restructured and moderately restructured schools on the clusters of dependent variables (three components of restructuring by school responsibility and teacher involvement) for responses reported in Table 4.1. The "Don't Know" response was coded as a "0" in the data analysis. Since "Don't Know" means that the teacher didn't know anything about the attribute for either the school/teacher level, the lowest value possible (zero) was assigned because this indicated the lowest level of involvement or responsibility.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4.1a

Summary of MANOVAs for Clusters of Dependent Variables, Broken Down by School Responsibility and Teacher Involvement Items (Don't Know Responses Included)

ITEM	Average Scores for Highly Restructured Schools	Average Scores for Moderately Restructured Schools	F Value	Significance Level
School Responsibility Budget/Finance(4)	9.65	8.17	16.02	p< .0001
School Responsibility Governance(5)	13.75	12.53	18.64	p< .0001
School Responsibility Curriculum(15)	39.21	36.94	8.66	p< .01
Teacher Involvement Budget/Finance(4)	6.60	4.65	39.38	p< .0001
Teacher Involvement Governance(5)	10.22	8.73	24.87	p< .0001
Teacher Involvement Curriculum(15)	33.11	29.26	22.17	p< .0001

Notes. The Don't Know (DK) response was coded as the value "0" in the data analysis. Since Don't Know means that the teacher didn't know anything about the attribute for either the school/teacher level. the lowest value possible (zero) was assigned.

There were 240 teacher responses included in this analysis.

Higher scores indicate more restructuring.

The results from the statewide study indicated that the ASRS successfully differentiated highly restructured from moderately restructured schools on 36 of the 48 items. MANOVAs (at the component level) and then ANOVAs (at the attribute level) were conducted, with the following results: all three MANOVAs were significant. 8 of the 8 budget comparisons were significant. 8 of the 10

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

governance comparisons were significant, as were 18 of the 30 curriculum and instruction comparisons. Results also indicate that the teachers perceived there to be more evidence of restructuring at the individual teacher level than at the school level on 19 of the 24 attributes.

Table 4.1b presents the summary results of similar MANOVA analyses in which "Don't Know" responses were eliminated. Eliminating the responses

Table 4.1b

Summary of MANOVAs for Clusters of Dependent Variables, Broken Down by School Responsibility and Teacher Involvement Items Don't Know Responses Eliminated

ITEM	Average Scores for Highly Restructured Schools	Average Scores for Moderately Restructured Schools	F Value	Significance Level
School Responsibility Budget/Finance(4)	11.11	10.15	12.00	p<.001
School Responsibility Governance(5)	14.33	13.85	4.10	p<.05
School Responsibility Curriculum(15)	41.15	40.53	0.60	n.s.
Teacher Involvement Budget/Finance(4)	7.95	5.77	38.69	p<.0001
Teacher Involvement Governance(5)	11.05	9.62	16.91	p<.0001
Teacher Involvement Curriculum(15)	35.16	31.87	9.40	p<.01

Note. Don't Know (DK) was coded as "no response", therefore, in the analyses it is reported as missing data. The number of responses of DK varied among clusters. There were 240 teachers' responses included in this analysis.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

resulted in different statistical results (means and significance levels) because the number of respondents decreased. The only cluster that was not significant in this analyses was the school responsibility for curriculum items. In this cluster 41 of the 110 respondents in the moderately restructured school selected "Don't Know "as their choice and 11 of the 130 respondents in the highly successful schools selected "Don't Know" as their choice. The other five school and teacher level clusters had statistically significant differences between highly and moderately restructured schools.

Tables 4.2 through 4.4 present the results of the univariate ANOVAs comparing the difference in means between the two sets of schools focusing on individual items. Table 4.2 compares the schools on the eight items measuring the budget/finance components. four at the school responsibility level and four at the teacher involvement level. All eight of the comparisons were statistically significant. such that teachers in the highly restructured schools gave overall higher restructuring scores to their schools than did teachers in the moderately restructured schools.

Table 4.3 contains data that compares the schools on the items measuring the governance/decision-making components. both at the school responsibility level and at the teacher involvement level. Eight of the ten comparisons were statistically significant. such that teachers in the highly restructured schools gave

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4.2

Comparison of Mean Scores for Items Measuring the Budget/Finance Component of Restructuring

ITEM	Highly Restructured Schools	Moderately Restructured Schools	F Value	Significance Level
Setting Budget Priorities (S)	1.95	1.34	14.68	p<.001
Setting Budget Priorities (P)	1.35	0.80	22.62	p<.0001
Hiring Staff (S)	2.65	2.35	7.03	p<.01
Hiring Staff (P)	1.64	1.07	35.07	p<.0001
Finding Alternative Sources of Funds (S)	2.40	2.08	5.33	<.05
Finding Alternative Sources of Funds (P	1.78	1.35	13.51	p<.001
Deciding How School Funds are Spent(S)	2.65	2.40	4.77	p<.05
Deciding How School Funds are Spent (P)	1.85	1.44	17.77	p<.0001

Notes. **School (S)** refers to the degree of responsibility the school has for the components of restructuring.

Personal (P) refers to the degree of personal involvement the teacher has for the components of restructuring.

A score of "3" indicates the school is highly restructured, while a score of "1" indicates it is not. The "Don't Know " response is valued as "0" in this analysis. The means in this table are based on 130 respondents from 5 highly restructured schools and 110 respondents from 5 moderately restructured schools.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4.3

Comparison of Mean Scores for Items Measuring the Governance/Decision-Making Component of Restructuring

ITEM	Highly Restructured School	Moderately Restructured School	F Value	Significance Level
Deciding Faculty Assignments(**S**)	2.82	2.45	15.02	p<.0001
Deciding Faculty Assignments(**P**)	1.55	1.25	11.44	p<.01
Establishing School Governance (**S**)	2.39	2.33	0.22	n.s.
Establishing School Governance (**P**)	1.72	1.54	2.34	n.s.
Promoting Decision Making (**S**)	2.75	2.44	10.18	p<.01
Promoting Decision Making(**P**)	2.12	1.77	14.34	p<.01
Involving Parents (**S**)	2.95	2.73	16.80	p<.0001
Involving Parents(**P**)	2.65	2.32	18.25	p<.0001
Involving Community(**S**)	2.84	2.52	12.56	p<.001
Involving Community (**P**)	2.18	1.89	12.15	p<.001

Note. Same as 4.2.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4.4

Comparison of Mean Scores for Items Measuring the Curriculum/Instruction Component of Restructuring

ITEM	Highly Restructured School	Moderately Restructured School	F Value	Significance Level
Arranging the School Weekly Schedule (S)	2.70	2.55	2.17	n.s.
Arranging the School Weekly Schedule (P)	1.85	1.55	8.03	p<.01
Arranging the School Yearly Schedule (S)	2.55	2.33	4.32	n.s.
Arranging the School Yearly Schedule (P)	1.78	1.46	10.24	p<.001
Arranging the Student Daily Schedule (S)	2.65	2.46	4.41	p<.05
Arranging the Student Daily Schedule (P)	2.55	2.10	20.51	p<.0001
Arranging the Teacher Daily Schedule (S)	2.74	2.53	7.14	p<.01
Arranging the Teacher Daily Schedule(P)	2.41	2.11	8.78	p<.01
Implementing New Roles (S)	2.68	2.34	13.74	p<.001

(table con'd.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ITEM	Highly Restructured School	Moderately Restructured School	F Value	Significance Level
Implementing New Roles (P)	1.81	1.39	14.99	p<.0001
Creating Special Programs (S)	2.60	2.37	3.61	p<.05
Creating Special Programs (P)	1.88	1.47	14.17	p<.001
Determining the Curriculum (S)	2.24	2.25	0.02	n.s.
Determining the Curriculum (P)	1.94	1.65	6.79	p<.01
Selecting Professional Development (S)	2.60	2.45	2.11	n.s
Selecting Professional Development (P	2.26	2.01	5.64	p<.01
Developing Parent Programs (S)	2.68	2.63	0.30	n.s.
Developing Parent Programs (P)	2.12	1.83	8.40	.01
Designing Ways to Teach (S)	2.44	2.16	5.73	p<.01
Designing Ways to Teach (P)	2.21	2.00	2.98	n.s.

(table con'd.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

ITEM	Highly Restructured School	Moderately Restructured School	F Value	Significance Level
Organizing Students for Learning (S)	2.76	2.69	1.02	n.s.
Organizing Students for Learning (P)	2.25	2.04	4.46	p<.05
Establishing Student Discipline (S)	2.74	2.77	0.28	n.s.
Establishing Student Discipline (P)	2.48	2.23	8.52	p<.01
Establishing Outcomes for Students (S)	2.66	2.65	0.04	n.s.
Establishing Outcomes for Students (P)	2.51	2.39	1.78	n.s.
Creating Climate/Culture (S)	2.68	2.47	7.63	p<.01
Creating Climate/Culture (P)	2.81	2.75	0.55	n.s.
Determining Assessment (S)	2.49	2.37	1.35	n.s
Determining Assessment (P)	2.27	2.28	0.01	n.s.

Note. Refer to Note. Table 4.2. 4.3.

overall higher restructuring scores to their schools than did teachers in the moderately restructured schools.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4.4 contains data that compares the schools on the items measuring the curriculum/instruction components, both at the school responsibility level and at the teacher involvement level. Eighteen of the thirty comparisons were statistically significant, such that teachers in the highly restructured schools gave overall higher restructuring scores to their schools than did teachers in the moderately restructured schools. Of the twelve comparisons that were not significant on the curriculum/instruction component, nine of these were at the school level.

Budget/Finance Component

The attributes of the Budget/Finance component of restructuring address the setting of budget priorities, hiring staff, finding alternative sources of funds, and deciding how school funds are to be spent. (See Table 4.2) The teachers in the highly successful restructured schools felt that their schools had a greater responsibility for these attributes than did the teachers in the moderately successful restructured schools. The mean scores of the hiring staff attribute shows that the teachers from both the highly and moderately successful restructured schools ($\bar{x}$ =2.65, 2.35) felt that their school had the power to hire employees, but the teachers themselves perceived their involvement in this process to be considerably less ($\bar{x}$ =1.64, 1.07). Teachers also felt that their school had some power to set budget priorities ($\bar{x}$ =1.95,1.34), but felt that they

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

personally had very little input over this attribute ($\bar{x}$ =1.35, 0.80).

Governance/Decision-Making Component

The attributes of the Governance/Decision-Making component of restructuring address deciding faculty assignments, establishing school governance, promoting decision-making, involving parents, and involving community. (See Table 4.3.) The only attribute that was not significant (on both the school and personal level) was establishing school governance. The mean scores of the teachers in both the highly and moderately successful restructured schools on the issue of governance shows that the teachers perceived the school ($\bar{x}$ =2.39, 1.72) and personal involvement ($\bar{x}$ =2.33, 1.54) at somewhat comparable levels. The highly restructured schools' teachers felt that the school had the responsibility for establishing school governance with about the same amount of personal involvement as the teachers at the moderately restructured school.

Curriculum/Instruction Component

The attributes of the Curriculum/Instruction component of restructuring addressed 15 different characteristics ranging from arranging weekly, daily, and yearly schedules to creating and implementing new programs, to establishing discipline, creating climate, and determining assessment. (See Table 4.4). There was very little difference between the mean scores of the attributes of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Curriculum/Instruction at the school level between the two types of schools with nine of the components being non-significant. On many of these items, the teachers felt that their school had responsibility for the curriculum/instruction attributes.

On the other hand, the responses to the teacher involvement items indicated significant differences in personal involvement between the two types of schools on all but four attributes (designing ways to teach, establishing outcomes for students, creating climate/culture, and determining assessment). The only two attribute pairs that were not significant on both the school responsibility and teacher involvement level were the ones identifying outcomes for students and assessment.

Summary of Statewide Quantitative Analyses

This study presents evidence for the validity of the ASRS, which assesses restructuring at both the school responsibility and teacher involvement levels. The results of the study are gratifying in that there is conclusive evidence that (1) a valid/reliable assessment instrument is available to identify and distinguish restructuring efforts at the school level based on teacher perceptions and, (2) reputational criteria may provide an accurate assessment and reliable measure of the degree to which schools are restructuring, since they substantially agree with the results from the ASRS.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The great majority of ASRS attributes at the school responsibility level were statistically significant in terms of differentiating between highly and moderately successful restructured schools; 22 out of 24 (92%) attributes concerning at the school responsibility level were rated by the teachers higher at the highly successful restructured schools than at the moderately successful restructured schools. The only attributes that were not given a higher mean school score were establishing student discipline ($\bar{x}$ =2.74 HRS, 2.77 MRS) and determining the curriculum ($\bar{x}$ =2.24 HRS, 2.25 MRS). Twenty-three of 24 (96%) attributes concerning the teacher involvement were rated higher at the highly successful restructured schools than at the moderately successful schools, with one exception being determining assessment ($\bar{x}$ =2.27 highly, 2.28 moderately).

Schools are perceived by the teachers in this study to be more empowered and in charge of their own destiny as far as fiscal responsibility, as evidenced by the responses on the budget/finance component. Teachers consistently felt that their schools were more responsible for the setting, finding, and deciding how school funds were to be spent. The teachers also felt that they were involved in these attributes, but on a marginal level.

Budget/Finance is viewed by these teachers as being the responsibility of the school, as opposed to outside control/agencies. Money is given to the school

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

(federal, state, local) or generated by the school (fund raisers, grants, outside sources, etc.), and the school has discretion as to how it is to be spent. Teachers felt that they do not have as much say-so as to how the monies are allocated and spent.

Hiring staff appears to be a function of these restructured schools, but the teachers have limited input into the final decisions about personnel. The decisions are made at the school, but teachers are not as involved in the selection process.

The school restructuring literature emphasizes the Governance/Decision-Making components of school restructuring, focusing on site-based management with teacher, parent, and community involvement. The teachers in this study were comfortable with the school having responsibility for the attributes found under the governance component. Teachers at both types of schools (high/moderate) indicated that the school was where decisions were made concerning involving parents/community and responded favorably toward their participation in the activities. Again, as in the hiring of staff, teachers felt that they personally do not have much influence in making faculty assignments, although they felt the school is in control of the process.

The attributes (establishing school governance-school/personal) capture the essence of site-based management. The attributes address whether the school established school governance not about the operation of the school governance.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Teachers from both types of schools rated the school's responsibility as very high ($\bar{x}$ =2.39. 2.33). but felt that they had about the same amount of involvement ($\bar{x}$ =1.72. 1.54). There is no difference in the amount of school responsibility and teacher involvement between the highly successful and moderately successful restructured schools. The irony of the results concerning this attribute is that teachers felt that the governance structures were put in place. but that they were not really part of its establishment. This has been problematic in many schools where site-based management has been a top-down dictate. Schools were told to implement a site-based council or governing body and few teachers were really involved in the creation and organization of the group.

Advocates of restructuring suggest that increasing teachers' involvement in decision-making will lead to the development and application of different teaching strategies and more engaging activities. Determining the curriculum was perceived to be a function of the schools by teachers from both types of schools. In fact. the mean score for the moderately restructured schools were higher ($\bar{x}$ =2.25) than the score for the highly restructured schools ($\bar{x}$ =2.24). On the teacher involvement questions. teachers at both types of schools felt that they had some ($\bar{x}$ =1.94) for highly restructured schools and very little ($\bar{x}$ =1.65) for moderately restructured schools' involvement in the determination of the curriculum. Therefore. curriculum decisions are a function of the school.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

but teachers in this study do not see themselves participating in choosing the particular curriculum content.

The attributes that address the arrangement of schedules indicate that the school has great responsibility for determining the weekly, yearly, and daily schedules of teachers and students. The teachers felt that they had some input into the weekly and yearly calendars, but felt they had a great deal of power over the daily schedules of the students and themselves. Teachers are involved in some of the decisions concerning scheduling, but when it comes to their lives and the students' well-being, the teachers are the final word as to how time is spent in learning and activities within their classrooms.

There were fewer significant differences on the curriculum issues, indicating that teachers did not perceive distinctions between the schools on several of these dimensions. Thus, highly restructured schools are not that different from moderately restructured schools, according to their teachers, on issues such as determining assessment (school and personal level), establishing outcomes for students (school and personal level), determining the curriculum (school level), designing ways to teach (personal level), etc. The concerns of Fullan (1993) and Taylor and Teddlie (1992) that restructuring may not be changing the "learning core" are partially supported by these results, although the overall pattern of results indicate that there are some changes in highly restructured schools at all levels.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

New roles, professional development, special programs, climate, assessment, and outcomes for students were all attributes that teachers felt were the schools' responsibility, and that the teachers had a great amount of involvement in the implementation process. The involvement of teachers at the moderately successful schools was considerably less than that of the highly restructured schools on these items, even through the degree of responsibility at both school levels were relatively the same. Teachers in the moderately successful schools did not feel that they were as involved in the restructuring efforts. These perceptions echo many teachers feelings about new school-wide innovations: if the teachers are not part of the planning and have not "bought into" the change, then the innovations' chances of succeeding are suspect.

Validation of the ASRS

This part of this study addresses the development and validation of an easy-to-administer, research-oriented instrument to assess the components associated with school restructuring. This analysis is preliminary since the total number of observations (n=240) is not adequate for a final validation study. I plan to gather more data in the future to complete the analysis.

The components of the Attributes of School Restructuring Scale include Budget/Finance, Governance/Decision-Making, and Curriculum/Instruction. (Refer to Table 3.4 for a description of the items broken down by components). The ASRS was constructed specifically for this study as a perceptual measure of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

restructuring using selected empirical criteria to produce an inclusive, properly validated, research oriented instrument in this area. The previously utilized instruments found in the restructuring literature have served different purposes than that envisioned for the instrument developed through this study. There was enough evidence from the pilot study to indicate that the instrument had construct validity (See Chapter 3).

Since the data were available to do a preliminary validation of the ASRS, I decided to calculate the instrument's item-subscale correlations, construct validity based upon factor analysis, and reliability based upon the computation of Cronbach's alpha. The following sections of the validity study include: instrument development, determination of face validity, item-subscale correlations, construct validation, reliability, and a summary of the validation study on the ASRS.

Instrument Development

A thorough review of the research literature on restructuring identified three major components of school restructuring: Budget/Finance, Governance/Decision-Making, and Curriculum/Instruction. Teacher Participation in Decision Making developed by Bacharach, Bauer, and Shedd (1986) served as a guide for The Attributes of School Restructuring Scale After an exhaustive literature search to find a instrument more suitable to this study, I decided to use the structure and format of the Teacher Participation in Decision

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Making to construct the ASRS. Some items included in the ASRS are directly linked to the categories listed in the Three Components of School Restructuring. Many of the items included in the ASRS are taken directly from the other survey and are also part of the Three Components of School Restructuring. It was necessary to reword the categories to express the intent of the survey.

Part One of the ASRS is designed to identify the school restructuring efforts within a school and the extent to which that effort is perceived by the teachers in the school. Part Two of the ASRS is designed to identify the amount of involvement of the teacher in the restructuring effort. Further details regarding the instrument 's development are included in Chapter 3.

Determination of Face Validity

No formal content validation of the instrument was done, since it is difficult to determine the content domain of attitudinal scales such as the ASRS. Instead, the face validity of the instrument was determined. Face validity as defined in Borg and Gall (1989) is concerned with the degree to which a test appears to measure what it purports to measure, whereas the other forms of test validity provide evidence that the test actually measures what it purports to measure. Although face validity can never take the place of the other forms of test validity, it is still important because most people react more favorably to tests having high face validity.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

A common approach to determining face validity of an instrument is to consult a panel of experts. According to Anastasi (1982) face validity pertains to whether the instrument "looks valid" to an appropriate audience: in this case, this appropriate audience was a group of education administrative professors, graduate students, and classroom teachers. Altogether the instrument was given to three professors in Education Administrative Departments, five graduate students in Education Administration, and seven classroom teachers. On the basis of the input from this panel of experts the instrument was reduced from 60 items to the final number of 48 items. Items were eliminated for the following reasons: didn't make sense, repetitious, and difficulty in eliciting the preferred answer.

The form of the ASRS used in this study is the 48 item version found in Appendix 1. A revised version of the ASRS will be developed based upon data from the current validation study. Items may need to be eliminated due to poor item-subscale correlation or failure to "load-up" on factors determined by the factor analysis.

Item-Subscale Correlations

An analysis was run to search for adequate correlations between individual items, their subscales (Budget/Finance, Governance/ Decision-Making, and Curriculum/Instruction), and the total score on the ASRS (See Table 3.4). All 48 items were included in the analysis. Item-total score correlations for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

this data indicated that each of the 48 items were positively correlated to the total scale score. (See Table 4.5). Values for the coefficients ranged from .30 to .65, with 19 above .50. Correlations between total scores and subscales were high and positive (.78 -.94): correlations among subscale scores were moderate and positive (.56 - .67). All correlations were significant at the $p < .0001$ level.

Table 4.5

Item-Subscale Correlations for the 48-Item ASRS

Item Score	B	G	C	Total
Budget/Finance (B)				
B1	.80			.55
B2	.77			.53
B3	.55			.44
B4	.61			.53
B7	.76			.59
B8	.74			.57
B9	.58			.55
B10	.70			.58
B Subscale	-	.59	.56	.78
Governance/Decision-Making (G)				
G5		.43		.40
G6		.47		.44
G11		.72		.61
G12		.75		.61
G13		.63		.49
G14		.59		.50
G15		.48		.36
G16		.55		.40
G17		.49		.44
G18		.56		.45
G Subscale	.59	-	.67	.82

(table con'd.)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Item Score	B	G	C	Total
Curriculum/Instruction (C)				
C19			.46	.41
C20			.51	.51
C21			.48	.47
C22			.42	.41
C23			.41	.37
C24			.44	.42
C25			.45	.42
C26			.40	.38
C27			.50	.45
C28			.58	.59
C29			.56	.57
C30			.60	.65
C31			.42	.41
C32			.47	.51
C33			.46	.49
C34			.49	.53
C35			.40	.33
C36			.52	.50
C37			.59	.54
C38			.58	.54
C39			.44	.38
C40			.48	.44
C41			.46	.39
C42			.45	.42
C43			.38	.30
C44			.43	.32
C45			.50	.48
C46			.37	.35
C47			.48	.44
C48			.38	.30
C Subscale	.56	.67	-	.94

Note. All correlations are significant at the $p < .0001$. Item prefix "B" refers to Budget/Finance. "G" refers to Governance/Decision-Making. and "C" refers to Curriculum/Instruction.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Item-subscale correlational analyses indicated moderately high, positive coefficients. (See Table 4.5). The correlations between individual items and Budget/Finance ranged from .55 to .80; between individual items and Governance/Decision-Making from .43 to .75; and between individual items and Curriculum/Instruction from .37 to .60. These correlations were all significant at the $p<.0001$ level. These data indicated adequate relationships existed between items and their subscales

Construct Validation

Construct validity indicates the extent to which an instrument measures explanatory concepts or constructs that account for performance on the instrument. Factor analytic techniques are frequently used to confirm the existence of such constructs (Anastasi, 1982; Crocker and Algina, 1986). Factor analysis is a statistical method to simplify the description of data by reducing the number of necessary variables, or dimensions. Factor analysis serves many purposes: first, to determine how many latent variables exist within a set of items on an instrument; second, to provide an explanation of the variation among the original variables using a new set of fewer factors; and third, to define the substantive content or meaning of the factors (DeVillis, 1991). The new set of factors allows the researcher to reduce large numbers of items to a smaller number of factors which share variance.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Rotating factors allows for the best possible fit of items to factors. The process can proceed through a variety of methods. Orthogonal rotation assumes that factors are not correlated and includes varimax, quartimax, and equimax approaches, which offers different combinations of items to determine groupings for each factor (DeVillis, 1991). The specific technique used in this study was a principal components factor analysis, with a varimax rotation, which is the standard technique used in construct validation studies (e.g. Teddlie, Virgilio, & Oescher, 1990). A series of analyses were conducted in order to find the "solution" or set of factors that best described the constructs that underlie the Attributes of School Restructuring Scale (ASRS).

Preliminary Factor Analyses

Three sets of factor analyses, with various iterations, were conducted to analyze the data. The first set of factor analyses involved analyzing all 48 items of the ASRS and included two steps: (1) the number of factors were not specified in the first iteration: a solution was determined mathematically, using a default option of the SAS factor analysis procedure (SAS, 1985: eigenvalue =one); (2) in the second iteration, a three factor solution was forced. The default solution yielded 15 factors for the 48 item scale, and many of these factors were not interpretable.

The forced three factor solution, which was conducted because there were three theoretical scales, yielded mixed factors. The three empirical scales did not

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

conform to the item grouping predicted by the three theoretical scales, described in Chapter 3 (Budget/Finance, Governance/Decision-Making, Curriculum/ Instruction). Specifically, empirical factors one and two each included items from all three theoretical scales, while empirical factor three contained items solely from the curriculum/instruction scale.

The second set of factor analyses involved analyzing each set of theoretical factors separately. This set of analyses was run because the three factor solution generated mixed factors that were uninterpretable, while the item-subscale correlation coefficients indicated that the three theoretical scales were somewhat independent. The Budget/Finance scale generated a two factor solution that was interpretable, and the Governance/Decision-Making scale generated a four factor solution that made theoretical sense. These factor analytic solutions will be discussed further below.

The Curriculum/Instruction scale generated a nine factor solution that included some uninterpretable factors. Specifically, eight items did not load up on factors in an interpretable manner. These item pairs (school & personal level) were: 21 and 22 (Arranging the school yearly schedule; 39 and 40 (Organizing students for learning - grade, class, etc.); 41 and 42 (Establishing student discipline procedures); and 45 and 46 (Creating climate/culture of the classroom). At this point, I decided to eliminate these eight items from further analyses. As noted above, one purpose of this factor analytic work was to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

determine if certain items should be eliminated because empirical results did not conform to expected response patterns based on the theoretical factors. Since these eight items generated patterns of responses that were not easily understood. and did not fit the theoretical constructs. they were eliminated. This reduced the items from a total of 48 to 40.

Final Factor Analyses

The final solution for the 40 item ASRS involved three separate factor analyses. described in Table 4.6. 4.7. and 4.8. All retained factors had an eigenvalue of 1.0 or greater. The two retained factors accounted for 64% of the variance in item responses on the Budget/Finance scale. The four retained factors accounted for 68 % of the variance in item responses on the Governance/Decision-Making scale. The seven retained factors accounted for 68% of the variance in responses on the Curriculum/Instruction scale. All scale items within a given factor had factor loading values of .50 or greater.

Table 4.6 contains the factor structure for the 8 items related to the dependent variable identified as Budget/Finance. These 8 items loaded up on two factors evenly: items 7. 8. 9. and 10 were aligned with under Factor 1 and items 1. 2. 3. and 4 were aligned within Factor 2. All of the scale items within these two factors had factor loading values ranging from .58 to .82.

Table 4.7 contains the factor structure for the 10 items related to the dependent variable identified as Governance/Decision-Making These 10 items

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

loaded up on four factors in an interpretable manner. Factor 1 contained items 15, 16, 17, and 18, with factor loading values ranging from .50 to .76. The other 6 items loaded up in pairs with three factors. These pair factor loading values were considerably higher (.68 to .89).

Table 4.6

Factor Structure for the Budget/Finance Items on the 40-Item ASRS

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2
B1		.58
B2		.57
B3		.82
B4		.79
B7	.78	
B8	.74	
B9	.78	
B10	.74	

Table 4.7

Factor Structure for the Governance/Decision-Making Items on the 40-Item ASRS

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
G5				.86
G6				.68
G11			.88	
G12			.86	
G13		.70		
G14		.89		
G15	.76			
G16	.62			
G17	.75			
G18	.50			

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 4.8

Factor Structure for the Curriculum/Instruction Items on the 40-Item ASRS

Item	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4	Factor 5	Factor 6	Factor 7
C19			.65				
C20				.62			
C23			.81				
C24				.80			
C25			.79				
C26				.81			
C27	.68						
C28	.70						
C29	.72						
C30	.79						
C31		.78					
C32		.73					
C33		.70					
C34		.52					
C35					.62		
C36					.67		
C37					.64		
C38					.70		
C43							.77
C44							.67
C47						.74	
C48						.83	

Note. Item prefix "B" refers to Budget/Finance, "G" refers to Governance/Decision-Making, and "C" refers to Curriculum/Instruction.

Table 4.7 contains the factor structure for the 22 items related to the dependent variable identified as Curriculum/Instruction. These 22 items loaded up on seven factors in an somewhat scattered, but interpretable manner. There were two pairs of items (43, 44; 47, 48) that loaded under two factors, two groups of three items (19, 23, 25; 20, 24, 26) that loaded under two factors, and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

three groups of four items (27, 28, 29, 30; 31, 32, 33, 34; 35, 36, 37, 38) loaded under three factors. Factor loading values ranged from .52 to .83.

Reliability

Determination of the reliability of the ASRS is another important step in the validation process. Several authors (e.g., Borg & Gall, 1989; Huck & Cormier, 1996) have concluded that the preferred method of assessing the internal consistency of instruments with multiple response choices is coefficient alpha, or Cronbach's alpha. Cronbach's alpha is very versatile because it can be used with instruments made up of items that can be scored using three or more possible responses.

Assessments of internal consistency focus on the degree to which the same characteristic is being measured. Internal-consistency estimates of reliability (coefficient alpha) for the total scale and for each of the three subscales of the ASRS were calculated. The obtained coefficient for the modified inventory of 40 items was .91, a range between .90 to .92, for the Budget/Finance, Governance/Decision-Making, and Curriculum/Instruction components, respectively.

Development and Validation Summary

This validation of the ASRS resulted in the modification of the instrument for future use. Eight items from the curriculum/instruction component area were eliminated due to the results from the factor analyses and from their low

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

correlations with the total and/or skill area scores. The final version of the ASRS consists of 40 items instead of the original 48 items and addresses the three components of school restructuring. This validation study established preliminary face validity, construct validity, and reliability of this modified instrument.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter 5
Qualitative Results

One application of case studies is to describe the real-life context in which an intervention or innovation has occurred. Yin (1989) defines case studies as examining a range of complex social phenomena and representing a holistic approach to research. In addition, Yin felt that case studies are process oriented describing the mechanism of the intervention or innovation. Quantitative research gives parameters and measurements to set criteria while qualitative research (case studies) allows for a broader discussion of perceptions, attitudes, and interpretations of situational conditions by members of the organization under study. By utilizing both quantitative and qualitative methods in this research, confirmation of quantitative and qualitative findings are possible. The quantitative section of this study is enhanced and expanded by case studies which give greater detail to the relationships in the schools.

Qualitative research has often been used to explore and gain insight into areas where little information has previously been available. Another valuable application involves using qualitative research as a tool for adding depth and detail to previously completed quantitative data analysis. While statistical results may suggest general patterns found across a given sample, extending the meaning of those patterns through qualitative methods may provide additional

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

information. Used in this way, quantitative analysis identifies the areas of focus and qualitative analysis gives richer meaning to those areas (Patton, 1990).

When using qualitative data to provide deeper meaning, one purpose of the research is to show what the survey respondents might have meant when they answered in a particular manner. In addition, this qualitative extension may suggest how the research fits together as a whole. While the role of qualitative research as an exploratory tool is generally well understood, the confirmatory role of qualitative analysis is less well understood.

The quantitative data presented in Chapter 4 summarized the statewide results. The results of the district pairs are presented in this chapter along with the qualitative studies. The State is divided into eight regions and all were asked to suggest by reputation a district that was restructured based on the Three Components of Restructuring (Figure 1.1). The Effective Schools Managers identified eight districts from the eight regions where varying degrees of restructuring were occurring. Three districts were eliminated from the study after the interview with the district representatives, who felt that their districts did not meet the guidelines of the restructuring study. The remaining five district representatives were interviewed and they confirmed their district's restructuring efforts and identified the schools where restructuring plans had been formulated and implemented. In this section, a descriptions of the ten elementary schools in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the study are presented. These descriptions vary in depth and detail according to how much restructuring has occurred.

The five regions in this study are from five distinctly different parts of the state. There is a variety of urbanicity, school population, teacher/student ratio and geographic location. (See Table 5.1) In order to get the maximum amount of candid information, personnel at the district and school levels were promised anonymity. The names of the districts, schools, and personnel have been assigned pseudonyms.

Table 5.1

District Demographics

Pairs	District	Urbanicity	Population District/ Teachers	Geographic Location
# 1	Wheeler	Rural	10,000/700	Southeast
#2	Jackson	Urban/Suburban Rural	61,000/4,300	Southeast
#3	Butler	Urban/Suburban Rural	50,000/3,300	Northwest
#4	Stuart	Rural	6,500/450	Midwest
#5	Longstreet	Suburban/Rural	31,000/2,000	Southwest

Table 5.2 presents the participants in the study by their pseudonyms. Listed are the districts, schools and principals. Shown are grade configurations and student populations for each pair of schools. The teacher section of this table

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

includes not only classroom teachers. but support personnel at the schools. These ten schools are representative of the types of elementary schools found in Louisiana. There is a variety of sizes and school configurations. along with the teacher populations that are reflective of the auxiliary and ancillary personnel assigned to the school for support and assistance.

Table 5.2

District/School Demographics

Pair	District	School	Grade Level	Principal	Students	Teachers
#1	Wheeler	Pickett	PS.K-2	Bragg	450	32
#1	Wheeler	Sherman	PS.K-2	Sheridan	255	21
#2	Jackson	Johnston	PK-5	Martin	650	44
#2	Jackson	McClellan	K-5	Buell	500	31
#3	Butler	Lee	PK-5	Hampton	600	44
#3	Butler	Grant	PK-5	Farragut	360	27
#4	Stuart	Hood	4-5	Buchanan	545	41
#4	Stuart	Pope	6-8	Thomas	745	46
#5	Longstreet	Forrest	K-2	Polk	200	20
#5	Longstreet	Meade	K-4	Burnside	860	49

The qualitative component of this study was designed to answer additional research questions. and also to add depth to the survey results. In this study. the case studies include five pairs of schools which were visited for two days each. and follow-up visits were conducted to establish and confirm first impressions.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The highly successful schools were selected for their advanced restructuring and the moderately successful schools were selected based on their limited to modest restructuring efforts. The case studies of the districts and the schools within each district begin with a description of the district and district support structures, followed by a description of each school. Included in the description of each school is the physical school setting, school climate, and culture. There is also information about each school's organizational structure and procedures. The following section contains information about the principal's work as a change facilitator and the teachers participation in the changes at the schools. Lastly, included in this qualitative portion are the results of the teacher surveys from the district across the three components of restructuring (budget/finance, governance/decision-making, curriculum/instruction) and a narrative pertaining to these three components. Each district will be discussed, but only the first district presented has all of these elements told in great detail. The remaining districts are narrative vignettes varying in depth according to how much restructuring has occurred.

An examination of the schools in this study focus on the demographic data, site visits, superintendent interviews, principals interviews, teacher interviews, classroom observations, and teacher survey responses in each of the ten elementary schools. This chapter is important in setting the context of the study and bringing to the fore questions left unanswered through survey research.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The schools differ in size, grade configurations, ethnic distribution, and in a number of other areas. They are similar in aspects of restructuring that extend and expand the focus of restructuring Louisiana schools.

School Pair # 1, Wheeler District

Setting

Wheeler District is configured as a river district located on both sides of the state's largest river. It is a large district of some nine hundred square miles. Although it is considered a rural district, Wheeler is in the process of changing due to the network of industries which have grown along the river and industrial canal corridor. The new interstate connects Wheeler to the state's largest metropolitan center some thirteen miles away. Because of the urban decay in the center, Wheeler is becoming a new bedroom community for middle class people who want to live in a less stressful environment. The district schools are predominantly white, and the trend is to become even more so due to flight from the city to the suburbs.

Wheeler is considered a wealthy district because of the influence and influx of commercial money into the system. The industries have instituted a "good neighbor" policy toward the district and the tax base is supported mainly from this revenue. There is a waiting list of teachers wanting to teach in these schools, and high salaries and an equally high teacher support structure keep the list full.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The history of the district is varied and interesting. This district has typically been composed of pockets of ethnicity with little cross culturization. It was settled originally in the early eighteenth century by French fur trappers and those French and Spanish who made their living on the river. Up into the 1960s. children were still arriving at school from down the bayou in pirogues. At the end of the century, a large group of German farming families settled in one bend in the river. Following the American Civil War, freed slaves tended to stay on the land as tenant farmers raising sugar cane and soy beans. and many of these people inter-mingled with white families. As a consequence, racial distinctions in parts of the district are so blurred as to be indefinable. In a landmark ruling arising from a suit brought from this district. the United States Supreme Court defined "race" as what is on a person's birth certificate and cannot be changed in later life.

Demographically the district is seventy-five percent white with only twenty percent of the population having less than a high school degree. The labor force is 57% white collar worker and that percentage is the fastest growing part of the labor pool with agriculture soon to disappear entirely. The cane fields which surround the bridge connecting the two sides of the district seem to shrink every year. Tradition is deep rooted here and the majority of the school personnel are district natives. The average family income is well above the national and state range. but there are pockets of deepest poverty where drugs.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

crime, and teen pregnancy rate cause problems for the district schools. Much of the restructuring plans were made with these "in crisis" students in mind.

District Support

The impetus for restructuring came from two sources and occurred simultaneously: the central office's desire for change and the hiring of a superintendent committed to a new vision of the district schools. These two forces converged to make Wheeler unique in its district effort. Although there had been pockets of attempted restructuring across the state, it had not been very successful anywhere. The new superintendent knew that it is extremely difficult to move a district forward without vision and a common goal of all the parties.

The new superintendent, Dr. Davis, was hired as a result of a national search. The man who preceded him was a local "good old boy" who fit in quite well with the school board which, at the time, was interested in preserving the status quo in education. Dr. Davis and a newly elected school board began their tenure at the same time and both were committed to change.

In 1992 Dr. Davis and the central office brought people in from outside to discuss Restructuring. After months of preparation, these outside people, representatives of the schools and community decided on the 12 components. Research shows that doing these simultaneously is better than piecemeal. In retrospect, this was a mistake. This was too ambitious and on too massive a scale. The number should have been reduced and broken down into two phases

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in order to do a better job that didn't require so many things to be working on at the same time.

1. Virtually all students can learn at high levels and can be taught successfully
2. Schools must be performance or outcome-based
3. Assessment Strategies must change
4. School success is rewarded and school failure is remedied
5. School based staff should play a major role in shaping instructional strategies
6. Major emphasis must be placed on staff development
7. Quality Pre-Kindergarten programs are crucial
8. Health and other social services must be provided at levels sufficient to reduce significant barriers to learning
9. Parental involvement must be increased
10. Community involvement must be increased
11. State-of the-art technology must be addressed
12. Facilities will be well maintained and will meet the needs of an increasing population

Figure 5.1

Wheeler District's Essential Components of a Successful School District

The next part of the plan was to search for corporate funding among the many petro-chemical plants along the industrial corridor. The district entered into a contract with Southern Carbon International for a $1.5 million grant over a 5-10 year span for restructuring based on these twelve components. Unfortunately, at the same time the state was revising the Minimum Foundation Program (MFP), the State's funding formula for supporting education. Wheeler stood to lose 19 million dollars in funding because they had been able to generate their own revenues, and on the basis of equity, the state would have redistributed

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

its money to the needier districts. Dr. Davis was instrumental in petitioning the state to place Wheeler in a "hold harmless mode", which would freeze the money allocated for the district. but prohibit additional state monies using the formula. This formula is predicated on a per pupil basis and Wheeler has received more since that time. but only because of the growth of the district. When this financial crisis became common knowledge, the district residents were very concerned. They stepped in to help the schools by increasing their own taxes. Hurried elections were held where millages were renewed. bond issues passed. and the money was funded for additions. renovations. and new schools.

Once the monies were assured and the twelve step plan had been approved Wheeler district was set to restructure the schools. Dr. Davis led the way saying. "Restructuring entail a willingness to change--fundamental change which strikes at the heart of our cherished assumptions and time honored paradigms." He was aided in this by a very supportive central office. One principal interviewed says that the central office "trusts this school to do what needs to be done. We have earned this trust in the manner in which we aggressively pursue excellence." Central Office personnel have a true relationship with school because many of them have "done time" as a principal, teacher. or student. This relationship is not just limited to a single clique of schools: the Central Office supports all of the schools and the teachers equally.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Because this district is small, there is a family-type relationship among the central office and the schools. The central office personnel are always ready to support and to listen to any reasonable request. They will do research on topics and attempt to tailor programs to fit school needs. Another principal interviewed believes Wheeler is "always moving forward, with the reputation of a 'good' district...considered progressive and employs innovative practices."

One of these innovations was a reorganization of the school calendar. Days were built into the school year for teacher sharing/inservice. Of the 180 teaching days set by the state, five are usually allocated for emergency days which may be needed in case of natural disasters. Wheeler District used these five days in a different way. In addition, the parish added days to the school year. Three days are designated for record keeping (two days prior to the beginning of school and one day at the end of the year). Four days were used for district meetings and five half days were given back to the schools to use as they saw fit. This means that the teachers in Wheeler work three more days than the rest of the state and the district pays the difference.

The two most positive elements of district support are the strong staff development and the intensive training given for innovative practices in Wheeler. Staff development has always been excellent, but even more so during the years of restructuring. To encourage interest in the proposed changes, the central office provided stipends for after school and Saturday training. The district staff

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

trains in cadres which provides a diffusion of innovation and as one staffer says. "It causes a ripple effect throughout the district." In this way, all parties concerned from teachers to the highest central office staffer knows what is going on in the district schools. Because of good public relation efforts by the school personnel this same accurate information has been disseminated to the public at large. Everybody in this district is aware of the goals of the district and the schools. They are well-versed in the process as well as the outcome goals of restructuring. They know what is expected and can articulate the goals and the rationale behind them.

Pickett

Setting

Pickett (Highly Restructured School, HRS) was built in 1957 as a regular 1-6 grade elementary school, but is now a Pre-K through second grade primary school. The physical plant is located on the river road in sight of the levee. It sits on a small low shoulder black topped road in the midst of low income houses. There is a neglected park on the corner of the street near the school, and neither the physical plant nor the grounds are very impressive. There are three parallel red brick buildings with interior hall walls of the same exterior brick. The land is very flat and entirely denuded of indigenous willow river trees that grow along this stretch of the district. It is apparent that money has been poured

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

into the school's renovation over the years, since everything has been updated that could be (e.g., library, playgrounds, offices).

There is a new metal roof on the school replacing the old shingle type. The bathroom fixtures are all new and in proportion to the needs of small children. The floors are new vinyl blocks and there is an interesting feature to the halls. Two straight different colored lines have been painted through the school halls which the teachers use to line up the children or as directions in evacuation and tornado drills. All the rooms are bright and well equipped with cupboards built in every room. There is a large cabinet built over each classroom hall door for coat and book bag storage. Interior air conditioners are hung from the ceiling in each room and can be individually controlled, but the jalousie windows near the top of the hall walls, once used for circulation, now help give the place a light and airy look. One outside corridor is closed off to form an indoor rainy day area which is rather dark, but one which the children find to be cozy.

The exterior of the school has large changeable murals drawn by students or guest artists. Since this is a river district, the theme of the school is life among the flora and fauna of the bayou/river with the halls and special purpose rooms serving as showcases for work of students and local artists. The cafeteria is a welcoming place with flower arrangements on each table and artwork on the walls and the children are encouraged to submit suggestions for meals and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

special treats. The cafeteria can be partitioned off for class practice on the small stage at the end of the room, but it can be adapted for use as a larger auditorium with the removal of these partitions.

The grounds are manicured with luxurious flower beds. There is an emphasis on parent volunteers at Pickett and it shows in the way the school is carefully maintained. A small stone fountain surrounded by a flower bed greets visitors at the entrance to the school and the basketball goals are freshly painted and hung low for little players. Because there is a busy side street the entire school grounds of at least two acres is fenced and gated for security. Inside the school visitors are asked to sign in, but they are welcome and encouraged at Pickett. There is a huge staff at this school and one can count at least fifty cars in the parking lot each day.

Every room is fully equipped with computer equipment, as well as all sorts of video equipment on each grade level. The library and the office have full fax and online services and each classroom has been provided a portable telephone. Money is plentiful and although the district monitors these expenditures, it defers to the individual schools to know what is needed.

The main wing of the school houses administrative offices, a large teachers' lounge, workroom, guidance office, testing rooms, and dining room annex. There are copiers, computers, and the ubiquitous ditto machine all run by a full time aide and parent volunteers. The two Pre-Kindergartens are large

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

cheerful rooms with much equipment and teacher/volunteer made instructional material. There is a small class of handicapped Pre-K and Kindergarten who have their own room and seem to be an autonomous part of the student body, since their special needs are always put to the fore.

The first grade wing is structurally like the previously mentioned part with the library and reading labs also located in this area. The library is state of the art computer ready facility well stocked and much used. Like the Kindergarten classes, the first grade classes seem to be so fluid that a child could leave the room and go to another without any appreciable confusion as to what was going on that day. Perhaps because of the homogeneous structure of the student population, the teachers work on the same system.

The second grade wing seems to be more individually structured with some being traditional and some quite unique depending on the personality of the teacher. Since this is the transition grade to upper elementary school there is some value in demonstrating different ways of teaching. There is a noticeable diminishing of the mothering that has taken place in the lower level as the children near the third grade.

School Climate/Culture

Following consolidation, the school population of 460 students is 65% plus African-American and 10% Hispanic. The remainder is white or Asian, but 5% of the children speak English as a second language such as

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Spanish, Vietnamese, and Cambodian, and these children often translate for their parents. Since many in the student body are children on AFDC or refugee status there are many parents who have free time in the day and they are encouraged to visit the school. Eighty-seven percent are on free or reduced lunch, and parents who sign up and pay in advance can eat lunch with their children at any time.

There is a significant disadvantaged population feeding into this school and most of these are either from single households or are unemployed agricultural workers. There were three small schools that were combined to produce the new Pickett School. The area that these schools comprised ran for a dozen miles along the winding river road and back some two or three miles into the cane fields. The African-American families who came to Pickett from this area are historically impoverished, and some live in homes that are over a century old. The people are allowed to live there at the pleasure of the landowner. The churches have always been the predominant influence in their lives. The staff at Pickett has had to fight a deep rooted sense of distrust and malaise from these families concerning the public schools. Home and school relations have been fostered by newsletters, conferences, and home visits. These specific and deliberate efforts have strengthened the lines of communication in a community which is divided by space and culture, but unified in concern for children.

The children come to primary school with little if any background information other than what they have picked up from television. The usual

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

household contains a large number of extended family members, but half of the adults may be functionally illiterate. Those parents who can work, leave the younger ones home with those who are old or otherwise unemployable. To benefit these families, Pickett School encourages these adults to participate in the academic life of the children. It is also a effective way to make inroads in the impoverished community and encourage trust of the school system. It is Pickett's aim to break the cycle of poverty and illiteracy by bringing everyone into the world of learning, and the staff works hard at it.

The climate of the school is that of a very busy place where children, parents, and teachers know their job, with those who are afraid of hard work shying away from the principal and Pickett School. The school population finds this work challenging and satisfying, with the principal at the heart of the challenge. Mrs. Bragg's eagerness is a spur, and her support is a comfort to a faculty who does not feel pushed to perform. Rather they feel privileged to participate in the restructuring process, which seems to be working for the benefit of the children at Pickett. There are high expectations for pupil progress which are celebrated each year at the awards day ceremony attended by large numbers of family members and local dignitaries at a time when home and school relations are at their highest.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Principal as a Change Facilitator

Mrs. Bragg, the principal at Pickett, arrived at the school after it had been consolidated for three years. During those first years following consolidation, things had not gone very well at Pickett. At first there was little unity or cooperation between teachers, parents, and students and there seemed to be too many children with unsolvable problems and little interest in taking up the banner of a common goal. The principal who preceded the present administrator had begun to turn this negative situation to a positive one.

Supported by the district system, Mrs. Bragg, completed this transformation by the middle of her second year. She followed the previous plan of asking questions, listening to answers, and staying out of the way while the work was going on. This convinced skeptical teachers that they could make a difference, while at the same time she reached out to parents and families in the community encouraging them to come together for the good of the children. Mrs. Bragg had been successful due to both her own work and the work of the previous administration. Currently, there is a fusion of purpose and a high sense of idealism at Pickett, due in great part to the encouragement and staff development instigated by the school administration.

Mrs. Bragg is a woman in her mid-forties who is a home grown product. Born into a family of educators, she attended Pickett as a child and she taught here and at other schools in the district. Because of a sentimental interest in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

continued growth of Pickett, she left her position as assistant principal at a nearby school. She has finished with the class requirements for her doctorate and is determined to complete her work toward this degree. Mrs. Bragg feels that no matter how far she rises in the district system Pickett will be her emotional anchor as far as individual schools are concerned.

She has been a force for restructuring since the subject was first put on the table. According to Mrs. Bragg, "restructuring means continuous improvement...not dismantling, but extending good things that are working and eliminating those that aren't." She knows that money is the key to getting good personnel, and she has always taken the attitude that higher salaries breed better teachers. She interviews her teachers in great depth. Since there is a waiting list, she has the luxury to pick and choose who gets preference for what position.

At the beginning of the restructuring effort, the principal at Pickett asked the teachers what they thought would make a difference in their approach to teaching. Mrs. Bragg also asked the parents what they wanted for their children. With the answers to these questions, she began to give people what they wanted, and the result was a restructured school that constantly evolves as situations change with the times. With the help of the district system, she gets to choose what positions are open at the school. There are a number of auxiliary personnel associated with the school; a school nurse who visits twice a week, a full time

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

guidance counselor, a truant officer, and a staff psychologist who is assigned to the school to work with the guidance counselor.

School Organizational Structures

Pickett School was the product of the reorganization of the river road schools in Wheeler District. The school had been a K-4 white, middle class school which changed with its new population to a significantly disadvantaged and minority school. When the three different schools from five different communities merged to form the new Pickett, the principal at Pickett was replaced. She had been an autocratic administrator who could not manage the merging of three different faculties. Mrs. Bragg was chosen because she understood that what was needed for Pickett to be unified was a change in structure and procedure as drastic as the change in the student body and the faculty.

The first change she encouraged was a site based council composed of members of the five different communities and teachers. It took a number of meetings for the council members to understand the process of school-based decision making. After making some decisions on their own, they realized they were empowered to affect changes in the school. This steering committee began to make decisions about programs and teacher training. Mrs. Bragg was instrumental in setting up an elaborate mechanism for communication and training at the school. Cadres of teachers trained by the central office instructed

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the rest of the staff and invested time in workshops during the school year and in the summer. The district system fosters this endeavor by giving teachers extra days to meet and paying them for these non-instructional days. Over a period of eighteen months, Mrs. Bragg's plan to unify the Pickett school community began to coalesce under her guidance.

A very important decision made by the school council was to become involved in two programs which had just become available to the district schools. The state university located near Wheeler became part of the Accelerated Schools Program (ASP) based at Stanford University. On learning about this new program, the school council decided to become part of the Accelerated Schools network and applied for admission. Since Pickett fit the criteria of the ASP due to the high number of disadvantaged children at the school, Pickett joined the Accelerated Schools Program. Faculty members attended workshops and informational sessions via a satellite link with Stanford in California.

The first year of ASP is called "Taking Stock", which establishes strengths and prioritizes needs which helped to unify the faculty and force them to develop a vision for the school. The restructuring effort and the Accelerated Schools program coincided to address the philosophy of teaching and learning, staff development, and leadership. It provided a mechanism for realization of needed change and support from the district which was critical. According to Mrs. Bragg, "The ASP was not viewed as separate from the district restructuring,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

but brought it all together. All schools throughout the district had the same opportunity to restructure. Pickett has made advanced progress, and I think it is because of the Accelerated Schools focus aligned with restructuring."

The second program the council chose to participate in was the Special Plan Upgrading Reading (SPUR) based on Effective Schools research which focuses on the instruction level. The research developed is a list of seventeen indicators of school effectiveness used in the SPUR program to move the curriculum toward effectiveness by improving the instructional level of teachers. Mrs. Bragg stated that the "Accelerated Schools Program helped with the governance structures, and the SPUR program helped with the curriculum and instruction." As an example of educational democracy this process of shared decision making and collaboration between different groups changed the structure of the school operation from a principal run school to a school run school.

Teachers in Change

Because of the disunity which followed the reorganization of Pickett School, there was a lack of trust and harmony among the teachers. There was a 30% turnover of personnel during this time which had been expected by the administration. Some teachers transferred and some preferred to retire rather than change to another school. The suspicion level was so high that those teachers who remained or transferred in chose to isolate themselves in the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

classroom. Setting aside the suspicion, this sort of isolation was in the nature of teaching and management in traditional schools. Often teachers are isolated with minimal support for instructional needs and required paperwork, with limited discretion in curricular, and with limited options for career advancement and professional development. It took months of hard work and encouragement by the school council and the cadre of trained teachers to restructure this attitude. The teachers said in interviews that it was hard work becoming unified, but they feel it was worthwhile because they are more motivated and the students are learning more and have a better attitude toward school.

One teacher mentioned that "there were a lot of new strategies to get teachers to buy into as well as different levels of change. In the beginning, there were too many problems to focus on, but the restructuring efforts brought the vision together and allowed us to work in union for the school and the children and stop working alone in the classroom."

One thing that all the teachers interviewed agreed upon was the positive change in the tenor of the school. Teachers made repeated references to the frenetic nature of the school day before restructuring. The whole language approach to learning helps to integrate subject areas and form a more cohesive pattern of scheduling the day. Children stay in the classroom more since the school has revised most of the programs which took children out of the class for large blocks of time. A casual visitor to the school may not see much difference

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

between Pickett and a more traditional school, but upon closer observation it is apparent that the classrooms are not run under total teacher directed instruction. According to the Classroom Observation Instrument (COI) quantitative coding, there is a great abundance of group work, time on task, integration of knowledge and skills across discipline, and command of subject matter. The faculty at Pickett make excellent use of peer teaching and outside staff as instructors on special projects.

The faculty has come a long way since the consolidation years, and the evolution from disunity to unity is evident in the teacher's sophistication concerning problem-solving, instructional strategies, and performance based outcomes/assessment. One teacher summed up her feelings by saying, "we never before felt that we could get what we needed from the school to help us in the classroom. Sometimes we did not even know what to ask for, but now we ask and we receive. We have the power to make decisions for the good of the children and our good as well."

Components of Restructuring

Budget/Finance

The thorny problems of budget and finance were of paramount importance to the district's Restructuring Plan. Traditionally, the district had kept a strict centralized control over the public funds which were used by the schools and had allowed little discretion to personnel at the school site, but never before had any

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

school received large lump sums to disperse using a site-based budget. Mrs. Bragg was part of the district team that rewrote the budget part of the site-based management plan, which would change drastically how finances are handled by district schools. According to Mrs. Bragg, the budget areas were prioritized by the district team using a rating scale (1-5) based on concern and importance. This committee then developed the fiscal activities and decided whether these decisions should be district based or collaboratively based.

The Central Office gives each school a budget for the school year and then allows the school to decide how this lump sum should be spent. The schools make their own decisions about where the money is to go and there are no line items from the district. The school then decides the line items, and these funds can move from account to account without permission from the system. Mrs. Bragg started using a team approach to budgeting last year stating that "most teachers don't have the experience in the budget and finance component, but they are quick studies when it comes to money. I think this provides an interesting study in personalities showing how some teachers are freespending and some are protective of the school's funds." Before restructuring each teacher had been given a hundred dollars to spend as they needed. Now they have the chance to deal with large sums of money and it has certainly been a learning experience for them. As Mrs. Bragg states, "Before they didn't even know how much it cost to run a school, and now they have a say in where those thousands of dollars go."

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Teachers at Pickett have been encouraged to generate funds for the school in various ways. They have the usual sorts of fund raising activities such as selling candy, book fairs, and school carnivals, and they are also very successful at writing grants at Pickett. The central office is very helpful in disseminating the information about available grants in a timely manner, holding special workshops that target grant-writing and assisting in the writing of these grants. These forms of fund raising and decision making about finances give the teachers and the site based council a feeling of ownership of the school which was absent before restructuring.

Governance/ Decision-Making

Governance and decision making at Pickett is highly structured process involving teachers, administrators and parents. The structure is a by-product of the Accelerated Schools Program which encourages school based governance including many of the elements incorporated at Pickett. The decisions at Pickett are made at the cadre level by teachers who style themselves "a site council" along the lines of a traditional Building Level Committee (BLC). The faculty reinforces their commitment to restructuring by having one morning each month set aside for a dialogue about pertinent issues such as multicultural education and inclusion. According to the ASP plan, there is also a steering committee of parents and teachers, which makes some decisions and the administrators make some on their own. The steering committee meets every other week to study the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

log book where teachers have proposed ideas and solutions to problems. This log is used as a guide to track what the teachers want and need the steering committee to be aware of at the school.

As an example of how this log guides the decision making and changes policy, teachers at Pickett felt that the reporting system was inadequate or inappropriate for the content of the restructuring programs. After researching the subject, they and the steering committee developed a nongraded report card, and asked the district to be allowed to pilot test the instrument. The report card was so successful that it is now being used district wide.

Curriculum/Instruction

The programs listed in the informational brochure published by the District about Pickett School read like a literature review of progressive educational "buzz words". All of these together form a cohesive lower elementary school "ideal" program. The programs form an accredited, developmentally appropriate, child centered approach to learning such as the whole language model of teaching reading.

The ASP helped focus the governance component of restructuring at Pickett, whereas the SPUR program is at the center of the curriculum restructuring. There is also a reading recovery program for the bottom 20% of the population which had an 87% success rate last year using four teachers per student. The Learning Connection program (TLC) is a district developed

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

program which encourages using literature as a base to foster reading. At Pickett this program is tailored for the students and teachers by using the Houghton Mifflin basal reader as the focus of their TLC program. Another pro-active approach to good teaching and learning is the Outcome Based Education program required as one of Wheeler's components of a successful school district. There are also many enhancements to the curriculum such as vocal music, library instruction, physical education as well as support staff: a school nurse, a counselor, and early childhood specialists.

Assessment is performance based using the new non-graded report card and portfolio assessment. There are no traditional ABC grades although there is some standardized testing in second grade. The test scores are good at Pickett and these are the only hard evidence of growth. To find other evidence of growth the faculty tends to look at patterns and trends with their goal to improve the bottom quartile of low achieving students. As additional assessment, the school has been doing "Mean Matching" with a national firm which comes in and matches the school with other schools across the nation, and then compares the achievement based on the closest match, instead of to the whole nation.

Pickett decided to abolish their developmental kindergarten when they instigated early literacy strategies. When teachers became comfortable with their integrated curriculum they felt they could address the needs of slower students with the confines of a first grade class. The school's technology has undergone

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

only slight modifications during the restructuring period. Although it is one of the district commitments, Pickett has not placed much emphasis on state of the art technology as part of the curriculum focus, preferring to become comfortable with the many other changes in the school.

Sherman

Setting

Five miles to the west and a mile back from the river is Sherman (Moderately Restructured School, MRS). It is located on a country road newly laid with asphalt. Woods and willows line the road with some isolated houses along the way. No neighborhood surrounds the school, and almost all of the children are be bus or carpool riders. It is a much more rural school setting than Pickett. The student body is drawn from families who have lived on the land for generations, and some are living in trailers or smaller homes or family property. There is indication of new growth in the area. A tract home subdivision has started some two miles from the school which will bring in a large group of white children, but the problem will be where to put them. At present Sherman school is much smaller than Pickett with only 255 students and thirteen teachers arranged in a Pre-Kindergarten through second grade configuration. The number of children in the school is limited due to the unusual architecture of the physical plant. Built twenty years later than Pickett, the school is structured as a "pod" which was a concept popular at the time in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

California. This precludes any sort of addition to the original structure. Any changes can only be accomplished with a rearrangement of space or addition of T-buildings for which there is ample room. Plastic, steel, and fiberboard give an artificial look to the school. The cheap white commercial grade brick facade of the school is unpleasant. Given its proximity to the waterways of the district, the brick is constantly covered with mildew and must be pressured washed twice a year.

The structure has a new metal roof as do all the schools in the district and this does help the look of the place. Inside the school has a dated look that much older traditional schools have managed to avoid. The small offices in the front and the tiny lobby are inadequate for the use. It is obvious from the added cabinets and shelves that the administration has outgrown its space. The secretary's counter and desk are right in the entrance hall. Anyone wishing to get to the storeroom or the custodial area must walk around her desk. A space has been cleared for the clerical aid jammed up against the secretary's desk. It is an area of constant noise and movement. The principal's office has a glass door so there is no way to have any privacy at all.

Behind the main building, there is a separate structure built of the same materials. This houses the cafeteria and auditorium which is connected to the main pod by a concrete breezeway. This area also serves as a rainy day playground. Given the acoustics it must be a noisy place when several hundred

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

children are busy playing. There is a smaller concrete playground behind the cafeteria with basketball goals. The grounds are not equipped except for the areas near the lower grades. These groups have set up their own little play place and equipped it with small climbing toys suitable to the age and size of the children. Sherman is an internalized school having little about the grounds to please the eye. This may be intentional because the inside of the school is interesting and possessed of a peculiar sort of charm about it.

The original architect must have envisioned a world of orderly children who would glide through the day in a silent love of learning. Planned with no interior walls to separate classes, the noise that first year was unbearable. By the second year permanent walls and moveable partitions had been placed throughout the building. Since that time, teachers have put in their own partitions to help baffle the din as well as provide wall space for display. There is a creative use of curtains and moveable blackboard in many rooms. One teacher built a small puppet stage topped with a storage space at the entrance to her room. Some rooms look like advertisements in a handyman's guide book. It does give the classes a very individual look even if it is a bit jarring.

The special purpose rooms have sprung in unlikely places. A former work area has been divided into the reading recovery room and a time out area where the guidance counselor works with special cases. By sheer inventiveness the staff has found space to accommodate a nurse's station, speech therapist, physical

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

education office, gifted/talented teacher, and visiting personnel. The teacher's lounge doubles as a workroom with the copier and other machines shunted into the makeshift corridor. It does not seem a very comfortable school to work in and it is a noisy building at all times. If not for the constant reminder from teachers to observe silence, no doubt the noise would be much worse.

The heart of the school as planned by the architect is the only area which retains his original purpose. The library is an open centrally located area. Square shaped and built on several levels one must step up and down on the soft carpeted steps. Low level book shelves are scattered throughout the area. The ceiling extends up some twenty feet to a skylight at the center of the school. Hanging from the skylight is a large wooden five sided clock. This gives the feeling of a town square and the librarian has used her space to great advantage. There are life sized stuffed animals of book characters clinging to columns or perched on the shelves. There is a media center and a lounging area with a sofa and bean bag chairs. Security mirrors are hung in each corner of the library to keep an eye on what is going on in the far reaches of the expansive room.

The librarian's desk is at the farthermost back part. Behind her are the closets which form one of the few original permanent walls. She has had to crowd everything up and there is a constant stream of traffic behind her and around her. The library is bordered with four foot high book shelves which she has used to good advantage. They are topped with glass display cases. Some

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

contain replicas of Beatrix Potter characters. Some contain stuffed birds or animals donated by friends of the school. There are antique toys in some cases and works from visiting artists. The library works well and the children enjoy it. This is due in part to the large wooded cap which hangs over the area to provide a sound baffle.

School Climate/Culture

Sherman Elementary School is a very busy place and has had more visitors in the past two years than all other years combined. These visits are from teachers, principals, supervisors and other school personnel from surrounding parishes, who consider both Sherman and Wheeler to be synonymous with quality, age appropriate instruction. Many visitors came to see Reading Recovery in action, as well as The Literacy Connection, whole language instruction, Outcome Based Education, and the overall positive approach to teaching.

When the teachers saw that Mr. Sheridan really wanted to make a difference in the teaching and learning activities, they began to come around to give him their support. Mr. Sheridan then teamed up with the principal at Pickett to form a partnership, sharing ideas and conversation based on their similar experiences and strong friendship from graduate school. They also had worked together for a short time at Pickett before Mr. Sheridan was transferred to Sherman.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

During the needs assessment at Sherman, the teachers determined that they needed more space in the classrooms, and there was money in the recently past bond issue just passed to pay for some renovations. Two years ago Mr. Sheridan closed in the back porch at Sherman and made additional classrooms for reading recovery and other small group instructional activities. The superintendent wanted him to close in part of the library, but he and the faculty committee felt the library was a focal part of the school, and they convinced the superintendent that theirs was the better plan. At the same time glassed in labs were removed from the grade center space, and extra area was given to the teachers within the classroom. In some rooms computers were moved out of the labs and into the new additional classroom space. In this way, the principal and faculty worked together to discover a mutually satisfactory solution to problems.

It was not so easy to satisfy the parental community around Sherman. There was a lot of ongoing public relations that have to be done on a daily basis to keep down the grumbling in this part of Wheeler District. It has been a long established tradition of this country community to want a man in control of Sherman School. Although there have been a few female principals at Sherman, historically no woman has lasted here longer than two years. Every female principal has been chased off by the complaints of the community, no matter how strong she was.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

It is to the advantage of the school staff to know the community, which is a closely knit one. Mr. Sheridan knew the school community and made several changes which were very necessary. There had been an "open door" policy at Sherman where people could just walk in a classroom and interrupt a teacher at any time, which was very disruptive to instruction. Now visitors must check with the office before they can go past the lobby. At first the parents had a real problem with this, but slowly they came to understand that this was better for the children and for the quality of teaching they would receive.

Sherman encompasses a large area, but, aside from the loss of the third grade, was not as involved in consolidation as Pickett was and got no new students from outside the original area. The PTA is an active and progressive club which has been instrumental in purchasing playground equipment, computers, and teaching materials for the classroom. Bayou Gas Company is the Adopt-a-School partner and has been instrumental in fostering parental involvement in the school as well as a steady source of funding. There is a very active volunteer program of local people who donate their time to work in the library, assist teachers with special projects and tutor students. Because the library remains at the heart of the school, students are encouraged to read books outside of the classroom and keep records of what they read. Each classroom has a reading incentive program and teachers provide an appealing reading corner to which all students have easy access.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The climate of the school can be characterized by change, and there does not seem to be a feeling of permanence here. The neighborhood is changing from rural to suburban with a large affluent subdivision under construction with new filings planned. This influx of new white children from two parent working families will change the student body, as well as swell the school population. Sherman School must adapt or be replaced with another newer structure, and because there is ample money to do whatever is necessary, the principal must provide the leadership to keep school running smoothly.

Principal as a Change Facilitator

The principal at Sherman, Mr. Sheridan, came from an unusual background. He was trained in art education and was teaching art privately before coming into the school system. He is in his late thirties and has a very calm, thoughtful manner, and noisy children or a lack of space does not seem to bother him. There is a serenity about his demeanor which inspires confidence. Mr. Sheridan knows the physical limitation of the school and works well with the majority white, rural study body. The principal wants to move these children to a higher academic level because less than fifty percent of their parents have a high school education and test scores for children are poor.

Mr. Sheridan does not want to use the word "inclusion" but he says, "To be honest, I think of this school as an inclusion school, and I try to get as much help for my children as I can with the support of the district." There are children

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of varying ages in the classrooms, and the teachers seem to go along with the idea of inclusion. The principal is sold on restructuring, with reading being the focal point of his plan. Mr. Sheridan promotes reading incentives, whole language approach, and Reading Recovery, and offers several enrichment classes in music, French, and vocal music. Although there is a true commitment to quality education, the overall plan has been slow in producing documented growth.

The principal has great communication skills and seems destined for higher positions than this principalship. He speaks in larger terms than just this school setting, accordingly, it will be no surprise if he moves up the ladder quickly into a central office setting. Mr. Sheridan is a native of this district and attended Sherman as a child. He does not want to take a position in the larger city near Wheeler District and intends to stay in this geographical area for life.

Before Mr. Sheridan came to Sherman as a principal, the school had a reputation of being "laid back", according to a teacher interviewed for this case study. Although parent satisfaction was high, the curriculum was not a priority, and teachers wanted to teach at Sherman because there was little to no pressure. Mr. Sheridan found strong teachers on staff, and although the quality of instruction was generally good, he was not comfortable with the lack of focus. In order to have more faculty involvement, he instituted a school improvement

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

committee, which conducted a needs assessment to address weak areas, decide where they were, and where they needed to go in the area of restructuring.

Because he did not wish to be an autocratic principal, Mr. Sheridan saw the need for more involvement from faculty in decision making, and he began to involve the faculty slowly with some few and small decisions. The reason he gave for this gradual process was, "They had no experience in decision making and I did not entirely trust them to do it properly. I guess I also did not want to overwhelm them with too many changes too soon." It was easier for Mr. Sheridan to change than the teachers, because he had so little experience with the elementary classroom curriculum. For the first two years of the last five, he spent ninety percent of his time in the classroom learning as much as he could about the curriculum. Because he was new at this, listening was what he did for most of these first two years, letting the teachers tell him about the weaknesses. Mr. Sheridan stayed after school to get administrative work done because he was seldom in his office.

School Organization Structures

Except for the loss of the third grade, Sherman School was not affected by the reorganization of the river road schools in Wheeler District. Before Mr. Sheridan came, some attempts at restructuring the school had begun under the former principal, who initiated steps toward getting the faculty to work less in isolation and more as a team. It was Mr. Sheridan who organized the parent

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

community and the faculty into working committees. He also promoted the site based management of Sherman in a subtle way, gradually leading his teachers in the direction of true restructuring before they knew it was happening. Mr. Sheridan had a vision of what he wanted the school to be and because he knew that it wouldn't happen overnight, he was patient.

The teachers appreciated the slow pace of change at Sherman and gave Mr. Sheridan credit for not forcing new things on them before they were ready. The teachers and principal spent a lot of time getting to know each other, and the trust generated in this process made the teachers willing to give Mr. Sheridan's suggestions a wholehearted try. In turn, Mr. Sheridan was patient enough to allow his teachers the opportunity to accept changes, without having to assert his leadership position.

The extensive committee framework at Sherman creates patterns of interaction which are district wide. At the monthly faculty meetings, news and decisions from the district are communicated to the teachers by their school representative on the district restructuring committee. Support groups from other schools on the TLC make reports, as do in house committees like SIC and SLBC.

A process to benefit the faculty was put in place at Sherman which allowed for teacher release time to attend meetings held in the school for problems and brainstorming. A helping teacher was hired to float throughout the school on an as needed basis. She assists in problems solving, provides extra

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

teaching help, or substitutes if a teacher has another meeting or an emergency. This release time allows faculty members time to focus on problems or unresolved issues without having to use instructional time from the students' day.

The professional development system has changed over the past few years. Before restructuring, teachers were inserviced on new topics in education at the school level, but now the district is more uniform in training and staff development by focusing on specific topics (e.g., conflict resolution, ability tracking, hands-on science and math). Representatives from each school attend these meeting and return to their home schools to train their fellow teachers. At Sherman for example. a teacher who is enthusiastic about science or wishes to learn about science will volunteer to attend a district training session and return to demonstrate the acquired knowledge and skills to interested faculty participants. This method of information sharing filters down to the parents who often attend these learning sessions. It is this sort of interaction which makes the new organizational structures and procedures at Sherman work to benefit the entire school community.

Teachers in Change

The school brochure boasts that at Sherman Elementary, the faculty, staff, and parents contribute to the success of the students. It states, "Highly experienced and educated faculty collectively have over 300 years of teaching experience. Twenty-nine percent of the faculty hold a master's degree in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

education and sixty-two percent have over ten years of teaching experience." Following restructuring changes at Sherman, there was no turnover in the faculty as there was at Pickett. This was due to the strong community feeling concerning Sherman on the part of the faculty, many of whom lived near the school and many of whose children go there. Also the faculty did not feel pressured by Mr. Sheridan to change too much or too quickly, and they were given time to absorb the new methods of whole language learning and the new governance methods.

The teachers feel that the administration is responsive to their needs. For example, the schools had always had an open door policy concerning parents, who could come and go throughout the school day. Mr. Sheridan changed this police which caused some resentment in both parents and teachers, until the teachers realized how fewer interruptions made their school day less hectic and provided more time for teaching. As one teacher put it, "For years parents had been bringing children in mid-morning with all sorts of excuses for them being late, and then coming back at noon to bring them lunch and staying to chat."

Another example of support for teachers occurred when the teachers at Sherman and Pickett came to their principals with problems they were encountering with the whole language program at both schools. There had been extensive training with national consultants and district personnel, but it was just not "taking" at these two school sites. The faculty committees and the principals convinced the district to send a group of ten teachers (five from each school) to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

an exemplary school in Dallas to observe the integration of the program. The faculty representatives at Sherman came back with a list of do's and don'ts and quickly inserviced the rest of the faculty, and solved many of their problems associated with the whole language program. A teacher at Sherman summed up the experience saying, "The trip was beneficial not only because it solved our problem, but it showed that the system cared enough about us and the students to spend a great deal of money instead of just sending for a speaker to talk about our needs."

When speaking about the difficulty of making so many changes, one teacher says, "This is very hard work, and there are too many areas to work on at the same time." That the teachers are willing to stay at the school and put forth the effort is a testament to their professionalism and concern for students. Restructuring has made teachers consider children as individuals, and they feel that the attitude of students has changed. Several teachers said that the children are more excited about school and come to school with expectations of learning that were not there before.

One of the reasons that the teachers at Sherman felt free to change was the architecture of the school itself. The pod arrangement lends itself to team teaching and the open dissemination of ideas more than the traditional self-contained classroom does. As a natural extension of this openness, the teachers felt free to risk using new techniques such as peer and portfolio assessment

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

because there is so much interaction between teachers in this school without walls. An example of such risk-taking was observed in a second grade class, where the teacher allowed a boy to practice for a student-led parent conference, while members of the other second grade critiqued his presentation. According to the coding of classroom observations (COI), the grouping of students is unique and intradependent. Teacher expectations and positive reinforcement are excellent attributes of the observed teachers in this school. Teachers at Sherman do not teach in isolation, but rather use close and continuous channels of communication with other teachers in the school.

Components of Restructuring

Budget/Finance

As part of the district's plan for restructuring, monies for the school budget is given to Sherman in a lump sum. The principal is the financial director of the school and disperses these funds at his discretion. Mr. Sheridan has been slow to permit faculty involvement in budget decisions past the suggestion stage. He allows his teachers to make financial decisions on a very narrow basis, and not on the entire budget, because according to Mr. Sheridan, his "teachers were not ready to have complete control of school money." He recalls that when Wheeler District began to restructure, it gradually allowed control of money to each school, and he is doing the same at Sherman. Mr. Sheridan appears to be the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

strong controlling man that Sherman community traditionally wanted as principal, and he holds the school purse strings, which pleases the community.

The teachers at Sherman are not unhappy with Mr. Sheridan's firm financial hand. They know that he will do everything he can to get money for the school and one teacher says, "If we want it, he gets it, somehow." Mr. Sheridan has by his own account gone "begging" at the door of industry as well as the central office for what the teachers might need. He is masterful at communicating his ideas, and he knows how to work the support systems to find additional monies for projects (e.g., multiple copies of paperback supplemental readers). Under his guidance, the teachers at Sherman have become proficient in grant writing and volunteer their time to hold fundraisers for the school.

Governance/Decision-Making

Governance and decision-making at Sherman has changed greatly since the days before the school was restructured and the process is still evolving. Previously the school was run in an autocratic manner with only the principal making what decisions there were, but with parents generally ignoring those decisions. When Mr. Sheridan decided to go with a complete restructuring plan he knew what that entailed, even though many of the teachers did not. He says that he knew "restructuring starts out with site-based management, but the teachers were not aware of this process. They just thought that I was allowing

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

them to get involved in what decisions had to be made at the school. They knew they had a council, but they did not link it to SBM."

Site Based Management was not a mandate from the district, but was left to the individual schools and principals, like Mr. Sheridan, who wanted to implement it. The district said they would like to see the teachers involved more in decision making at the "ground level", starting with mundane exercises and moving to more critical problems. The progression of decision making by teachers has been steady, but may be moving a little too fast for some teachers who feel that too much is demanded of them. Mr. Sheridan feels that this progress should continue and that teachers are well paid for their efforts.

The decision making at the school has evolved into an elaborate arrangement of committees and communication channels with every teacher involved at some level with making some kind of choices that affect the school. At the hub of this arrangement is the School Improvement Committee (SIC), which one of the teachers interviewed laughingly referred to as the "sick" committee. This is the committee composed of parent representatives, community members, and faculty which makes schoolwide decisions based on reports from sub-committees. These smaller committees include the School Building Level Committee (SBLC) which handles problems of student placement and makes recommendations for children who need special services. A twenty-five year veteran teacher assigned to this committee reported, "We do all we can do within

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the school to help a child and then we go on to report the child for evaluation by the district psychologist."

Representatives from each grade level work in groups of four to make reports to both the SBLC and the SIC. A committee of parents also reports problems and recommendations for changes in the school to the SIC. This system of committee and channels for communication at Sherman is a replication of the system in place at the district level. In Wheeler District Mr. Sheridan serves on the principals' advisory committee and represents all the elementary principals in Wheeler District. If other elementary principals have a problem, they come to Mr. Sheridan and he goes to the district supervisor at the central office. If a supervisor or director needs some information, they will just get in touch with Mr. Sheridan and he contacts the other principals. If there is something that the SIC at Sherman School wants to do involving the district, Mr. Sheridan will go to the appropriate supervisor. If the decision can be made without changing district rules it is allowed, but otherwise, the only thing Mr. Sheridan can do is just keep lobbying for change at Sherman School.

Curriculum/Instruction

It is the vision of Sherman School to be the best school in Wheeler District, and Mr. Sheridan believes that the school can attain this status and deliver the best quality instruction, if not necessarily the highest test scores. Faculty and administration wanted to give the children the best academic

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

foundation, but it was necessary to restructure the curriculum to do so. The restructuring plan was based on a whole language approach through literature. Teachers implemented whole language in the classroom based on the idea that children learn language by using it, writing it, thinking it, and reading it. This program was offered by the district which called it The Literacy Connection (TLC), and Mr. Sheridan proposed using this plan at Sherman on a voluntary basis. Teachers were encouraged to adapt this plan for use at Sherman, but were not required to do so.

Both Pickett and Sherman have TLC, but use it in different ways; Pickett uses the basal readers as the focus of their program, and Sherman teaches out of leveled kits. Both schools are involved in a support group of teachers for TLC, and have seen many changes in the original program. The children at both schools are passing the theme test for basal readers even though Sherman children do not use the basals. The teachers feel that the program is working for their respective schools, because they are willing to risk trying a new approach to teaching reading. The reason Mr. Sheridan thinks the curriculum restructuring worked was that he targeted the teachers before he targeted the curriculum by establishing trust and getting them to see the need for change rather than forcing them. All teachers that are doing TLC at the school say they would never go back to the old way, because the students are actively involved and the quality of writing is much higher. Parents praise the program, because they can see

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

progress in, not only the formation of letters and sentences, but also in vocabulary growth. Despite the acceptance and success of TLC, there are still two teachers at Sherman who teach in the traditional way and they are not forced to change.

Survey Results

The results of the MANOVA comparing teacher responses to the ASRS for this school pair is shown in Table 5.3. The overall pattern of results is not consistent with the pattern of results of the statewide study (Table 4.1b). While

Table 5.3

School Pair # 1, Wheeler District
Summary of MANOVAs for Cluster of Dependent Variables, Broken Down by School Responsibility and Teacher Involvement

ITEM	Average Scores for Highly Restructured School (HRS)	Average Scores for Moderately Restructured School (MRS)	F Value	Significance Level
School Responsibility Budget/Finance(4)	10.11	7.48	11.37	p>.001
School Responsibility Governance(5)	13.72	12.95	1.76	n.s.
School Responsibility Curriculum(15)	38.72	36.76	0.99	n.s.
Teacher Involvement Budget/Finance(4)	6.89	5.00	13.64	p>.001
Teacher Involvement Governance(5)	10.39	9.76	1.41	n.s.
Teacher Involvement Curriculum(15)	33.56	32.90	0.16	n.s.

Notes. See 4.1b
There were 39 teacher responses. 18 (HRS) teachers and 21 (MRS)teachers.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the statewide results for all schools was significant, the Wheeler school pair produced only a significant difference in the Budget/Finance Component on both the school (F=11.37) and teacher (F=13.64) level.

There is very little difference in the perceptions of the faculty at the Highly Restructured School (HRS) and the Moderately Restructured School (MRS) concerning the school's responsibility for Governance/Decision-Making ($\bar{x}$ =13.72, 12.95) and Curriculum/Instruction ($\bar{x}$ =38.72, 36.76). Similarly, the results of the teacher involvement in these two areas also shows little difference.

There is a difference on the Budget/Finance Component between these two schools. The HRS teachers reported that they were aware to a greater extent of the school's responsibility for the determination of the available funds and how they were to be spent than the teachers at the MRS. The teachers at the HRS also felt that they were personally involved to a great extent in the decisions concerning finances, while the teachers at the MRS had little responsibility for money matters at their school. The component of Budget/Finance is the only distinguishing feature between this pair of schools as evidenced by the results of the MANOVA.

As will be explained below, the similarity in ratings is a function of the district level commitment to restructuring. This is, without a doubt, the most highly restructured district in the state, and that overall support to a large degree mitigates individual differences between schools.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.4

Summary of School Restructuring Strengths, Pair #1, Wheeler District

DIMENSIONS OF CONTRAST	PICKETT (HRS)	SHERMAN(MSR)
District Support		
Commitment to Restructuring	●	●
Open Lines of Communication	●	●
Relinquishing Control to Schools	●	●
Personnel Involvement		
Teachers		
Commitment to Restructuring	●	◖
Implementation of Restructuring	◖	◗
Principal		
Commitment to Restructuring	●	●
Sharing of Responsibilities	●	◗
Organizational Structures		
Communication Network	◖	◗
Staff Development	●	●
Structured Learning Environment	◖	●
Components of Restructuring		
Budget/Finance		
Responsibilities for Budget	◖	○
Generating/Spending	◖	◗
Governance/Decision-Making		
Shared Decision-Making & Collaboration	●	◖
Parent/Community Involvement	●	●
Curriculum/Instruction		
Academic Focus	●	●
Teaching/Learning Outcomes	●	●
● Strong ◖Somewhat Strong	◗Somewhat Weak	○ Weak

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Cross-Site Analysis

The two Wheeler District schools (Pickett and Sherman), are compared in this sec ion using cross-site analysis techniques (Yin, 1989). The cross-site analysis was conducted in order to detect patterns in the data from the different cases, and utilizes both qualitative and quantitative data. In an effort to reduce and simplify the data, a summary table was developed to provide a focus for the two comparisons. Schools are compared on the basis of these contrast dimensions : district support, personnel involvement, organizational structures, and the three components of restructuring (Budget/Finance, Governance/ Decision-Making, Curriculum/Instruction). Subheadings under each dimension provide topics for focus and additional explanation of the larger headings.

A summary of the strengths of the restructuring process at both schools is presented in Table 5.4. Difference in the restructuring dimensions between the two Wheeler District schools are illustrated by reading across the columns. The biggest differences between the two schools are on the teacher involvement and Budget/Finance dimensions. These, and other contrasts will be elaborated upon in the remainder of this section.

District Support

As shown in Table 5.4 above, the degree of district support was identical in strength for both schools. Wheeler District is strongly committed to the restructuring efforts in both of these schools as well as the entire school system.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Within the last decade, Wheeler made the decision to allow patterns of restructuring to develop at individual schools by providing the mechanism for understanding restructuring efforts and assisting the schools in making appropriate choices.

Each school was given the same support and opportunity by the conscious decision of the system to allow site based management to occur on an "as wanted" basis. This control was given to the schools through staff development and open lines of communication. Each school was encouraged to participate in the development of ideas that would benefit the faculty in the change of philosophy from traditional to restructured. The central staff was always available as a resource and a guide, as well as providing stipend incentives for after hours faculty education. Both Pickett and Sherman received strong support from the District in all levels contrasted.

Personnel Involvement

The personnel section of Table 5.4 reflects contrasts concerning both the principals and the teachers at Pickett and Sherman schools. Teachers at Pickett felt a strong commitment to all aspects of restructuring. Some teachers at Sherman remained traditional and were not unified in their commitment to restructuring, which is illustrated as "somewhat strong" in the table.

Because the faculty at both schools made implementation choices, the contrasts are also different. The use of the Accelerated Schools Program at

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Pickett, for example, enabled the faculty to focus and integrate a number of new programs in a more successful manner than Sherman. The faculty and the student body at Pickett started out as strangers to each other and worked from the beginning in a non-traditional manner. Sherman did not go through as many changes from outside forces and preferred to remain more traditional longer, which is reflected in the "somewhat weak" rating on the implementation of restructuring.

The principals, on the other hand, were equally strong in their commitment to restructuring. Both principals wanted to see the new restructuring trends at their schools thrive and expand. Mrs. Bragg at Pickett had a healthy sense of trust in her teachers as illustrated by her strong willingness to share responsibilities of administration with her teachers, her support staff, and the parent representatives. Mr. Sheridan did not feel this same level of trust for those under his administration and kept control of many facets of restructuring, such as budget and curriculum. This difference between the two principals is illustrated by their differential ratings on principals sharing of responsibilities.

Organizational Structures

Both schools created committees to serve as the foundation of their organizational structures, but these committees functioned different at the two schools. At Pickett the committees were called "cadres" which network information in school and throughout the community. This cadre system has

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

been refined until it has become a smoothly operating of the chain of command, and it has become a strong method of solving problems and disseminating information. The committees at Sherman have shown a reluctance to take the sort of risks necessary to create an effective communication network; therefore, the ranking for that area is somewhat weak.

The Structured Learning Environment is stronger at Sherman School than it is at Pickett. This is the only dimension of contrast contained in Table 5.4 where the moderately restructured school is superior to its more highly restructured partner. For the most part this can be attributed to the fact that the physical plant at Sherman is well arranged for group work. The open atrium and use of movable partitions create an ambiance friendly to the sharing nature of a restructured school. The reconfiguration of the space has fostered teacher interaction and the sharing of teaching, learning experiences. Because Pickett has a traditional arrangement of classroom space, the teachers do not have as much opportunity to interact with others on a spontaneous basis, although they are very creative in their teaching methods.

Components of Restructuring

Budget/Finance

The category of Budget/Finance shows the largest area of difference in Table 5.4 based on the results of the teachers' surveys, interviews, and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

observations. Although they had been given district permission to do the same things, monies at the two schools are handled very differently. At Pickett the principal has given the faculty much leeway in how the allotted funds are spent, and this results in a "somewhat strong" rating for Pickett, as contrasted to the "weak" rating for Sherman, where the staff does not feel this sort of empowerment. Much of the budgetary control at Sherman is still held by the principal, who does not feel that the faculty is ready to make these decisions.

Both schools are strong in the desire to find alternative sources of funds rather than to rely solely on the District allowance, but with varying degrees of success. At Pickett the teachers and the administration were "somewhat strong" in generating funds and deciding how to use the money raised through grant writing and charitable contributions. Sherman School had raised outside funds, but shows a "somewhat weak" rating in making a collective decision on how the generated monies were spent.

Governance/Decision-Making

The table illustrates Pickett's "strong" rating on shared decision making and collaboration. Based on the results of the survey the teachers at Pickett felt very strong about the school's responsibility for making decisions about faculty assignments, establishing and promoting schoolwide governance, and decision making. Sherman ranked less strong, because teachers often felt "out of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

loop" when it came to how decisions were made and ideas shared. Both schools had strong parental and community involvement, which is reflected in Table 5.4 There had been a strong effort at both schools to involve parents and other interested parties in the community in school activities. The goal of a strong school, home, and community support network had been realized as evidenced by the numbers of parents and volunteers who became active in the school.

Curriculum/Instruction

As illustrated in Table 5.4, an analysis of the curriculum taught at Sherman and Pickett reveals "strong" ratings for both schools. The curriculum at both schools were restructured by the use of a detailed plan in order to address the needs of the individual student populations. The academic focus met the needs of students in the areas of basics, enrichment, and assessment. In the categories of instruction, ratings at both schools were "strong" due to a well developed system for imparting knowledge to the students.

Summary

Although Pickett and Sherman schools were quite different in curriculum and student populations, rankings on the dimensions of contrast are fairly similar. Both schools had an ongoing commitment to restructuring which, although begun at different times, remained very strong. The leadership was in place at both schools to continue this process, and the teachers had shown a willingness to

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

work hard at change. Parental and community groups accepted these innovations, and may, in time, embrace some enhanced versions of restructuring ideas. Both schools can be considered restructured, but they differ in half of the sixteen ratings, with Pickett receiving an overall stronger rating showing it to be the more highly restructured school. The primary drawback to complete restructuring at Sherman is the principal's perception that his teachers are not ready to make more and bigger changes.

School Pair # 2, Jackson District

Setting

Jackson is located in the southern part of the state and covers a diverse landscape and population. The district has two natural water boundaries on the west and east, thus, the district can expand in only two directions. Outlying areas of the district are rural and the district includes one of the largest cities in the state, with many urban and suburban settings. Demographically, the district is white collar (65%) and 27.5% of the entire population has a college degree or graduate school education. There is twice the state average of upper income households in this district. Despite the high education and income level of the district population, there have been no new schools built in this parish for the past 15 years. The district tax paying population has refused to support the public schools by passing any tax or bond issues. Competition between public

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

and private schools for students and money has diluted the influence of the public schools.

The city center is predominantly African-American, and public schools there are in most need of repair and attention. Moving out from the city core the schools are racially mixed and in better physical condition. The outlying areas of the parish contain schools with a predominately white student body. Some of these schools are the most recently built, but all are in need of repair and refurbishing. The two schools, as well as the district, were chosen solely on the reputational criteria established for the study. This district and schools also served as the pilot for the study.

Johnston

Setting

Johnston (Highly Restructured School, HRS) was built in the late 1960s in an affluent suburban area of the district. This neighborhood school has undergone a distinct change in student population that is reflective of the district's desegregation and redesign plans and two other factors. The neighborhood is aging, and the number of school-age children has declined. More importantly the city's largest Pre-K-8 parochial school is three blocks away. In this suburban setting, security is not an issue, since there is a police substation and fire station within a block of the school.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Johnston, one of the newer schools in the district, covers an entire city block. The physical plant is a modern, box-shaped structure built around an auditorium as the center of activity. Every available indoor space is utilized for programs (e.g., student mediation meetings in the corner of the auditorium partitioned off by moveable bulletin boards). The huge playground area, with a soccer/football field behind the school, is not fenced or barred in any manner. The school is immaculately maintained down to the choice of colors in the flowerbeds surrounding the entrance to the school. The climate that emanates from Johnston is one of efficiency, organization, and attention to detail.

Ms. Martin, Johnston's principal, is a respected member of the educational community with close ties to the school board and central office. She is a third generation educator and is a hands-on traditional educator, who is willing to experiment with any innovative idea which might benefit her students. Ms. Martin has garnered publicity and some celebrity as the author of two children's books. An avid grant writer, she actively seeks corporate sponsorship to raise money for her school. The handpicked faculty and staff at Johnston is a homogeneous group since Ms. Martin seeks those men and women who will fit in best with her program. At Ms. Martin's school, staff members rarely arrive after seven a.m. or leave before four in the afternoon. It is this atmosphere of dedication that has provided the opportunity for Johnston to be a pioneer and trend-setter of restructuring in the district.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

McClellan

Setting

McClellan (Moderately Restructured School, MRS) was built in a semi-rural area of the district in 1960. The school was planned to accommodate 600 students. At the time it was the only elementary school in a twenty-five mile square area. The school was built on a three acre tract of pasture land, and the school building has three large wings that occupy 35% of the land. The physical plant of the school is clean and tended, but it has little beauty aside from the oak trees which have thrived at the entrance to the drive. The neighborhood around the school was developed some sixteen years after the construction of the building. The well-cared for tract houses average 1500 sq. ft. of living space in this middle class neighborhood which is integrated and mostly comprised of two wage earning families. Some of the students are neighborhood children, but the transported students are from a wide variety of settings. Some handicapped students are bussed into the school, as well as white and African-American from all over the city. Forty percent of the 550 students at McClellan are bussed in from other areas.

Mr. Buell, the principal at McClellan has been an administrator at this school site for twenty years. He has seen the student body change from a largely rural population to lower to middle class children from all over the district. Mr. Buell's firm even-tempered manner imbues respect in the children who find him

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

to be a fair but exacting disciplinarian. The faculty and staff trust him because he stands behind his teachers absolutely. Somewhat of an autocrat, Mr. Buell is willing to give up power as long as he is confident that the results will be successful. He has suggested on more than one occasion that the principal at McClellan is his mentor when it comes to trying new innovations, strategies, and/or managerial changes. He just waits for Ms. Martin to try a plan at Johnston, cut through the red tape and remove all the obstacles and kinks in the plan; then he will implement the same budget, governance, or curriculum focus at McClellan. Mr. Buell is definitely not an innovator, but rather he is an adaptor.

Mr. Buell took an idea from Johnston concerning the budget and redesign. Like Ms. Martin, Mr. Buell used the budget money to facilitate his restructuring. Unable or unwilling to raise corporate money, he used what he could get easily to restructure using computers as his theme. The bulk of the redesign money was put into the library, where there is expensive equipment including, computers, interactive video, CD/ROM, and fax modem. The school pays for expanded cablevision, America On Line, and the Internet.

Mr. Buell chose to fill the third grades to capacity in order to have an additional teacher. This extra teacher was used to operate a computer lab and enhance the computer literacy focus of the school. Mr. Buell encourages parents with artistic impulses to use the school as their canvas. As a consequence, the library in particular is covered with wonderful, bright murals. Because Mr. Buell

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

is handy with tools, he has built many custom designed extras in the school like book nooks and storage space. He has even collected discarded construction materials to save money on these projects.

Both schools are in neighborhood settings. The African-American/white ratio is similar, but the gifted/talented program and the neighborhood students constitute the white student population at Johnston, while the neighborhood students at McClellan make-up the white population. The African-American population of both schools are bussed in from different parts of the district. The faculties of both schools have longevity and stability.

Survey Results

The results of the MANOVA comparing teacher responses to the ASRS for this school pair is shown in Table 5.5. While the overall pattern of results replicates the pattern of results of the statewide study (Table 4.1b), the difference in school curriculum was not significant for the two Jackson schools. This could be interpreted to mean that the teachers at both schools view the curriculum to be largely the responsibility of the school. There is very little difference in the perceptions of the faculty at the HRS and the MRS concerning the school's responsibility for the curriculum. Although teachers have more input into the design of the curriculum at the HRS than the teachers at the MRS, the mean scores were similar ($\bar{x}$ =41.93, 40.71).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.5

School Pair # 2, Jackson District
Summary of MANOVAs for Cluster of Dependent Variables, Broken Down by School Responsibility and Teacher Involvement

ITEM	Average Scores for Highly Restructured School (HRS)	Average Scores for Moderately Restructured School (MRS)	F Value	Significance Level
School Responsibility Budget/Finance(4)	11.83	10.85	9.14	p>.01
School Responsibility Governance(5)	14.61	13.82	6.88	p>.01
School Responsibility Curriculum(15)	41.93	40.71	1.62	n.s.
Teacher Involvement Budget/Finance(4)	9.21	6.31	21.63	p>.0001
Teacher Involvement Governance(5)	11.51	9.45	16.53	p>.001
Teacher Involvement Curriculum(15)	36.67	30.24	23.19	p>.0001

Notes. See 4.1b
There were 55 teacher responses. 33 (HRS) teachers and 22 (MRS) teachers.

The distinguishing contrast between these schools is the amount of involvement the teachers have in all three components of school restructuring. This could be attributed to the fact that the principal in the HRS is more comfortable in releasing responsibilities to the teachers. Conversely, the principal at the MRS releases this responsibility very gradually and hasn't allowed the restructuring to occur in all areas of teacher involvement. The effect sizes are largest in all three areas of teacher involvement between Teacher Budget (F=21.63), Governance (F=16.53), and Curriculum (F=23.19).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The results of the MANOVA's did differentiate between highly and moderately successful restructured schools in this district and did confirm the reputational criteria for admission into the study. The results also show that the teachers view both of the schools as having about the same responsibility for the three components of restructuring. The difference lies in the amount of involvement the teachers have in these components of restructuring.

School Pair # 3, Butler District

Setting

Butler is located in the northernmost part of the state which borders on the hill country of Arkansas. In many respects the district has more in common with that state than elements commonly associated with Louisiana. Demographically the district is 59% white to 40% African-American. At least 55% of the district population has earned a high school diploma. Average income is below state average, but above the average of that of Arkansas. Business and industry in the district is holding steady, but there has been no boom as has been noted in other parts of the state in the past few years.

Lee

Setting

Lee (Highly Restructured School, HRS) is located on the fringes of the more affluent suburbs of Butler. The school was built in the construction period of the middle sixties when the area was burgeoning with new homes and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

families. Since that time the population has aged out and this school was scheduled to be closed due to lack of numbers. The area around the school has cheap older homes and some service industries. The restructuring changes in the school has caused the housing market to remain steady rather than falling, as would be expected with the closing of an elementary school. This continuation of education at Lee School has been a positive influence on the economic and social life of the community around it.

The physical plant of the school is a mixed bag of architectural tricks. The original school was built as a sprawling low-tech plant emphasizing mechanics rather than esthetics. The addition of eighteen T-buildings and single library building has not added to the physical beauty of the school. The result is an unappealing jumble of maintained dilapidation. Although there is no trash and constant maintenance, the school never sparkles or shines with a look of a well for facility.

The district superintendent was behind the original plan to reopen the school as a neighborhood school responsible for its own decisions. It has been a slow trial and error process of evolution. More than restructured, it is radically different. Teachers have been a key factor in the plan. Teachers do not always see the school as autonomous. They see themselves as following guidelines, only some of which they have set for themselves. The school is open year round without the usual long summer vacation.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Lee is an alternative curriculum school which encourages participation from groups other than the white middle income neighborhood which surrounds it. African-American children were targeted for transfer into this schools from other areas. Three shuttle busses bring in these children, and the only other busses are from around the neighborhood. Only 50% of the children are carpool or walkers in this an extremely mixed school. There are gifted classes with an emphasis on computers. The entire third grade is conducted in a non-traditional team teaching atmosphere. There is a reading recovery program for first grade with a hundred percent success rate at the end of the year.

Mrs. Hampton, the principal is in her late 40's working toward her doctorate. She is an energetic ambitious educator dedicated to making this program work. Because economics plays such a part in these plans, she has learned to work the grant program. Mrs. Hampton and her teachers write multiple grant proposals and solicit help from business and industry. The school is a showcase for restructuring as witnessed by the constant stream of visitors and observers. The principal keeps in touch with security through her walkie-talkie and her cellular phone.

There is a busy hum to the school although the halls are quiet and ordered. There does not seem to be much time or place for the lazy learner at Lee Elementary School. If anything the school seems almost overloaded with programs to suit all purposes and all comers. There are 25 to 30 children in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

every room and finding available space is the most troublesome problem. To maintain balance and succeed, Lee needs constant attention, money, and high energy management.

Grant

Setting

Grant (Moderately Restructured School, MRS) is located in the heart of the historically African-American area of Butler District. The school is an imposing sandstone and brick building built in the 1925 as one of the first schools for African-American children. Although there is a constant maintenance problem with such an elderly structure, time has been kind to Grant. There is a grace and dignity to the lines of the building that transcends the occasional bit of peeling plaster. The poorly maintained grounds of the school are either blacktopped or covered with dirt and scrubby brush. The playground equipment is rusted junk which, if removed for safety's sake, would leave the children with nothing at all to play on.

Grant is an inner-city African-American school with all of the problems associated with that scenario. Students tend to be low academic achievers falling below the fifty percentile on the CAT. The school abounds with behavior problems of hostility, anxiety, depression, and lack of focus on the part of the students. There is a deficiency of educational and cultural experiences available outside the classrooms. In a neighborhood rife with gangs and drugs the sound

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

of gunfire is commonplace. Ninety-nine percent of the student body is on free lunch. The primary source of income is a monthly AFDC check and the bartering of food stamps for cash.

Because there has been no fluctuation in the size or demographics of the student body, the faculty has attempted to increase academic achievement with a restructuring program. The method chosen was a higher-interest experiential arts integrated curriculum. It was hoped that this would provide students with self-expression through involvement in dance, school plays, and musical performances, along with the visual and media arts. It would also provide a rise in self-esteem and self-discipline through the rewards and discipline necessary for the arts.

This proposal aimed to bring the children out of their restricted environment by taking them on field trips to cultural events. Guest artists were invited to visit classes. The use of "media" was encouraged as a window to a larger world. It was hoped that these influences would improve test scores, reduce behavioral referrals, and benefit the academic interests of students. In this way the Grant Elementary School of Arts would serve its 350 students and the community better than it had done in a traditional way.

On entering the school there are visual signs that an attempt has been made to conform with this new look. There are signs and displays proclaiming Grant as an artistic community. The hall bullentin boards are interesting and

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

well-executed. There is a great emphasis placed on links with African ancestry. Students are not allowed to forget their historic connection with that continent.

Inside each classroom there is an obligatory display centering on the arts, but nothing else suggest that art centered learning is a real part of the curriculum. There seems to be little going on that would not be seen happening in a traditional learning based school. There is no evidence that "media" has been brought into the classroom. There is a shortage of computers, televisions, and accompanying VCR players. A single roving art teacher lends here support to any teacher who requests it. She also visits each class once a week to teach art and give the teacher a break.

The principal at Grant is a very attractive African-American woman named Mrs. Farragut. She strives to be a role model for the school community as well as for the school children. Dressed with great style and neatness, Mrs. Farragut arrives early, stays late, and rarely leaves the school during the day. Having grown up in this area some fifty years earlier, Mrs. Farragut has seen the decline of strong families parallel the decline of education. She speaks eloquently and often of the need for African-American parents to involve themselves in school matters for the sake of their children. Mrs. Farragut hoped that featuring the arts in her restructuring plan would generate interest in the community and act as a lure for the parents. She has been able to draw some support from volunteer grandparents and some mothers. Mrs. Farragut has not

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

been so successful in promoting support from the adult male members of the neighborhood. This disappointment is painful to Mrs. Farragut who feels that male role models are sorely needed by her at risk students. Mrs. Farragut's good intentions and dedication to education cannot be faulted, even if they have not succeeded as well as she would hope.

Survey Results

The results of the MANOVA for this school pair is shown in Table 5.6. The overall pattern of results replicates the pattern of results of the statewide

Table 5.6

School Pair # 3, Butler District
Summary of MANOVAs for Cluster of Dependent Variables, Broken Down by School Responsibility and Teacher Involvement

ITEM	Average Scores for Highly Restructured School (HRS)	Average Scores for Moderately Restructured School (MRS)	F Value	Significance Level
School Responsibility Budget/Finance(4)	9.50	7.44	6.38	p>.01
School Responsibility Governance(5)	14.09	11.25	19.15	p>.0001
School Responsibility Curriculum(15)	40.38	33.56	16.55	p>.001
Teacher Involvement Budget/Finance(4)	6.29	4.69	5.95	p>.01
Teacher Involvement Governance(5)	10.41	8.44	8.20	p>.01
Teacher Involvement Curriculum(15)	34.08	27.88	10.08	p>.01

Notes. See 4.1b
There were 50 teacher responses. 34 (HRS) teachers and 16 (MRS) teachers.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

study (Table 4.1b). The results yielded a significant difference on all three components and both levels. The largest effect sizes are in the school's responsibility for governance (F=19.15) and curriculum (F=16.55). The HRS and the MRS are distinctly different in both the school's role and the teacher's involvement in all areas of restructuring. Teachers at the MRS indicate that there is less participation at the school level and less teacher involvement than the teachers at the HRS.

School Pair # 4, Stuart District

Setting

Stuart is located in the Midwestern part of the state. It is small, rural, and the district is separated into three distinct areas: north, south, and east. The main industry in the region is timber related, but there is also some cattle and pecan farming. Tourism is seasonal but active because of the many bass lakes in the area. There is a large prison and a large military facility located in the district. This somewhat skews the data for population racial breakdown, and the racial make-up of the district does not reflect the racial population of the school system. The district is 83% white, but the school district is 85% white. There is also a difference in the education attainment level because of these two facilities. The district's 57.6% high school attainment level in the school system is a higher than that of the district as a whole.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Each section of the district has schools that feed into the three high schools. The grade level configuration of the schools is somewhat unique. The northern part of the district from which the two schools for this study are located have five schools that feed into the area high school. These five schools are for grades PS-1, grades 2-3, grades 4-5, grades 6-8, and grades 9-12. A military installation is located in the vicinity of the schools and an itinerant student population attends these schools. The officers (majority white and possessing a Bachelor's degree or higher) from this base choose to live in the northern section of the district and commute to work because of the educational opportunities offered at these school sites. In addition to the military installation, the timber industry and chemical companies account for the district's economic income. Although the district population is rural the influence of these newcomers has a uplifting and sophisticating effect on the system.

The newly appointed district superintendent is working to make changes in the system, but this system is moving slowly. The district has a reputation of offering an excellent albeit traditional education, and the general feeling toward change has been "if it's not broke, don't fix it." The student population is racially mixed, and the predominantly white population has adjusted well to student integration. This may again be caused by the presence of the children of military personnel. The small influence of private schooling in this district is an indication of satisfaction with public schooling, and also in this predominantly

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

protestant district, the presence of Catholic parochial schooling is limited compared to other parts of the state.

Hood

Setting

Hood (Highly Restructured School, HRS) was first opened in September of 1952 as a junior high/high school. With the completion of the new junior high and high school in 1963 and 1972 respectively, the building was left to house the northern section of the town's fourth and fifth grade population. The school was renamed as a result of a faculty contest. The school is located on high ground in the middle of an large bare field. There is an absence of chain-link fence giving the school an open look, and there is no concern with security since this is a crime free area. The facility is quite expansive for an elementary school. There are wings and entire areas dedicated to band, art, and science left over from the secondary school days. The school is clean, light, and airy. The brick building was built to last and is maintenance friendly with plenty of room to expand, and some of the smaller children look lost in this large facility.

The principal, has been in the position since 1980. He is a native of the district and product of the school system. He is a white male in his early to mid-40's with an abundance of energy. Hood's principal has a reputation for being aggressive and innovated. He has been named educator of the year and is viewed as a child-centered leader. He is very popular in the district and is regarded as a

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

wonderful role model for students. He is always dressed in dress pants, a starched shirt and tie. He encourages the teachers in the school to dress professionally and they are happy to oblige.

The principal of Hood was a little surprised that his district/school were recognized as restructured. He felt that he, the school, and the district were making progress in that direction, but that things really hadn't changed much in the last few years. He indicated that the central office was reluctant to allow the schools to site manage. He felt that he had great latitude, but that this power was not given without a struggle. The principal was optimistic about the new superintendent and the plans he had outlined for the system. The principal felt that he was in a position to move to the central office and be a part of the new management team.

Pope

Setting

Pope (Moderately Restructured School, MRS) is a typical junior high school facility of the 1960s, which includes flat roofs, linear buildings joined by covered walkways, classrooms with windows opening to the outside, and halls lined with lockers . Although built only ten years after Hood, the Pope building looks much more dated due to the use of plastic and steel rather than more natural materials. Even though they are not attractive, the buildings and facility

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

are well-maintained. The outside walkways are constantly in use, but this cuts down on the noise inside the buildings. There is a quietness to the school with a minimum of noise when the students are moving and the distinct semblance of order. The student body was racially mixed, as well as the faculty.

The principal of Pope is a African-American male in his fifties. He is a long-time educator who is well-respected in the community. Like his counterpart at Hood, he is a excellent role model for the students. Unlike the other principal he moved up from coaching. The Pope principal went directly from classroom teaching/coaching to an administrative position following the attainment of his master's degree in administration. One of his strengths as a leader is his ability to delegate responsibility to his administrative staff and ancillary support group. The team approach is practiced at this school. Everyone has multiple jobs to do, and the principal monitors these from a distance and applauds success and addresses inadequacies. He has a reputation as an extremely fair and patient person willing to judge disputes in a gentle manner.

Survey Results

The results of the MANOVA for this school pair is shown in Table 5.7. The overall pattern of results does not replicates the pattern of results of the statewide study (Table 4.1b). The results yielded a significant difference in one component, but on both the school and teacher level. The largest effect sizes are

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

in the school's responsibility for budget/finance (F=9.44) and the teacher's involvement in budget/finance (F=10.71). The faculty at the HRS feel that the school is in command of its finances and the faculty has greater participation in

Table 5.7

School Pair # 4, Stuart District
Summary of MANOVAs for Cluster of Dependent Variables, Broken Down by School Responsibility and Teacher Involvement

ITEM	Average Scores for Highly Restructured School	Average Scores for Moderately Restructured School	F Value	Significance Level
School Responsibility Budget/Finance(4)	9.77	7.11	9.44	p>.01
School Responsibility Governance(5)	13.50	13.04	.038	n.s
School Responsibility Curriculum(15)	40.38	37.63	2.43	n.s
Teacher Involvement Budget/Finance(4)	5.11	3.44	10.71	p>.01
Teacher Involvement Governance(5)	8.78	8.74	0.00	n.s
Teacher Involvement Curriculum(15)	26.89	29.26	1.74	n.s

Notes. See 4.1b

There were 45 teacher responses. 27 (HRS) teachers and 18 (HRS) teachers.

the spending of these resources. The MRS is distinctly different in both the school's role and the teacher's involvement in budgetary matters. Teachers at the MRS indicate that there is less participation at the school level concerning finance issues, thus the teachers have little input into the disbursement of these funds.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The mean scores of the two Stuart schools are similar in both school governance ($\bar{x}$ =13.50, 13.04) and teacher governance ($\bar{x}$ =8.78, 8.74). With regard to school governance, the mean scores for the schools ($\bar{x}$ =13.50 HRS, $\bar{x}$ =13.04 MRS) are similar to the mean scores for the state ($\bar{x}$ =13.75 HRS, $\bar{x}$ =12.53 MRS). The HRSs in the state study ($\bar{x}$=10.22) mean score is well above the HRS in this district pair ($\bar{x}$ = 8.78).

In the areas of school governance, school curriculum, teacher governance and teacher curriculum there was no significant difference found between the mean scores of the HRS and MRS. This is dramatically different from the statewide analysis which reported significant differences in all components at all levels.

School Pair # 5, Longstreet District

Setting

The Longstreet District is located in the southwestern part of the state. The area is a very historic one having been settled early in the eighteenth century first by the Spanish and then by the French. The area retains much of this Mediterranean heritage in place names and cuisine. This has never been an extremely affluent part of the state relying as it does on the fluctuations of agriculture and the oil industry. Following the War Between the States, this district remained devastated financially until the oil boom of the late 1970s. Since suffering a recession some ten years later, the Longstreet District has not

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

passed a new school tax. Although the district has grown and stabilized economically, the public is reluctant to put any money into the schools.

This reluctance is confusing given that the private/parochial system is not particularly strong. The public cares deeply about keeping public schools viable, but not if it means adding to the public purse. Longstreet District is known for its volatile politics and the public school forum is a hotbed of constant discussion. This district is composed of small towns and rural areas with each one wanting to have a say in how things are done. In several schools the school board member has more hands on contact with parents than do the principals.

Demographically the area is 76.1% white. The 22.4% black population also contains many mixed race families whose French Catholic background means more to them than any connection to African-American heritage. This area has the highest percentage of Asian populations in the state due primarily to the influx of Vietnamese immigrants since 1974. These families are either Buddhist or Catholic, but they are great supporters of the public schools. Only half of the district adult population has achieved a high school degree, but because of the presence of a large university of some 15,000 students, the population holding a Bachelor's or higher degree is above the state and national average.

Although white collar workers comprise the largest work force, they earn less than the state or national average. Finances are spread across the board with

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

an alarmingly high percentage of the district living below poverty level and in single parent households. Children of these families certainly depend on the public school system and are at the mercy of property owners who do not want to pay more than they do already for the public schools. Money or the lack of it were the guiding reasons behind the original plan of restructuring.

The school board of the district wished to follow the trends of education and try some restructuring innovations. They did not quite understand what they wanted to do, but they knew what they wanted to accomplish. They wanted to try site based management as a way to save money using the federal Title One laws which allow schools to assess and request money. Although he was unclear about the principle of restructuring, the former superintendent of district schools went along with this plan, but did little to explain how this would affect the individual schools. Territorial battles resulted between board members over who would get what for the money. Principals and teachers had skirmishes over restructuring which sometimes led to transfers and early retirements. There was never a clear leader or a model restructuring plan for any of the elementary schools. Even mistakes made in accounting and dispersement of moneys were slow to be corrected if they were corrected at all. The action plan for school restructuring in the district was three years in planning and took only fifteen minutes at a board meeting to be destroyed.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Forrest

Setting

Forrest (Highly Restructured School, HRS) is located in the most dangerous poverty ridden part of the city which lies in the heart of Longstreet District. The school's 200 student population contains a large percentage of crack babies, developmentally delayed and special needs children. The Pre-K through second grade school is single race (African-American) with 75% of the students on free or reduced lunch. The home situation of these children is so dangerous that school has become the one safe place in their lives. Restructuring was supposed to add educational skills to that security.

The school was constructed in 1963 on a small plot of land one block from the railroad tracks that run through this dilapidated neighborhood. Large oak trees, which predate the construction of the school, line the entrance to the street giving the place its only "natural" look. The entire schoolyard is surrounded with high gated fences, some of them double fenced with reinforcing steel bars. The school is a concrete block building, topped with a concrete formed roof, laid out in a large rectangle around a center courtyard, all of which is absolutely hideous looking from the outside. Patch and paint is the best that can be done short of demolition to improve the facility, but the custodial staff works very hard to keep up the grounds, and the facility is very clean and tidy. Inside

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the buildings the scene is more attractive because the rooms are large, and the floors are shiny with wax.

There have been some innovative decorating ideas such as clotheslines for art hung from the pipes which run along the outside corridors. The large center quadrangle courtyard is neat with green grass, pine trees and attractive shrubbery among the play equipment. The equipment in the playground is new and colorful, with each area suitable for the size of the children who use it. At other places around the school wherever there is a little enclosed bit of grass, small gardens or benches have been set up for quiet areas of study or meditation. One of the most attractive additions is a key hole shaped arrangement of bricks paved for children to have outdoor recitations. There are two concrete benches set up for a small audience. The entrance to the school has two handsome plaques on which are written the school mission and the school beliefs. Next to these is an attractive Afro-centric mural donated by a local bank, which extends some ten feet along the concrete wall.

The administrative offices and the cafeteria have been newly renovated and seem to well maintained. Each classroom contains at least two computers and a resource teacher holds computer lab for each class for an hour each day. Each room has its own child-size bathroom and small sink. At the back of each room, a partition has been built from floor to ceiling in order to store the class materials and keep these things out of the teacher's way, which adds to the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

neatness of the room, and also gives a nice large space for displaying the children's work. The small children who go to Forrest are cleaner and better dressed than one would expect given the abject poverty of the area.

The principal at Forrest Elementary, Mrs. Polk, is an African-American woman in her late thirties, whose husband is also an educator in the district. The couple is well-known and well connected in local educational and political circles. Much local publicity has been given to this celebrated couple and all of it has been very positive. Mrs. Polk is touted as a role model for the African-American community as well as the pool of educators in general. According to everything one reads about Mrs. Polk, her future in education on at the level of principal and higher is very bright. Some of this is due to a fortunate mistake which occurred at the beginning of Mrs. Polk's tenure at Forrest.

Due to a clerical error at the federal level, Mrs. Polk was given four times the amount of money she initially asked for to restructure Forrest as an Afro-centric school. By the time the error was discovered, it was too late to correct it, and the money will be lowered every year for several years until it is at the appropriate sum. This large infusion of cash enabled Mrs. Polk to hire a home counselor, Title One teacher, reading teacher, four teachers, and four aides. The money was also used for community outreach programs and to repair and renovate the physical plant. Unfortunately none of this outlay of funds translated into higher test scores by the students at the school. The home counselor never

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

visited more than half a dozen homes during the first year and did not seem interested in getting to know the parents or the home situation. When he left, he was not missed by either parents or faculty.

Since the money was to be reduced each year, Mrs. Polk came up with an ingenious scheme in order to keep some of these personnel. She created two transitional second grade classes, to go along with the transitional first grade classes instituted by the district, in hopes of keeping the numbers of the students up and thus allowing the retention of more teachers at the school. Mrs. Polk does not seem to have an overall plan which would be appropriate for the budget eventually allotted to the school. Since Forrest has not been the overwhelming success she hoped for, it is doubtful that Mrs. Polk will stay at the school much longer, and she has already made comments about moving up the ladder to another position.

Meade

Setting

At Meade (Moderately Restructured School, MRS) there are so many problems it is difficult to know where to begin to chronicle them. Lying on the rim of the district, the area surrounding Meade is rural and middle class for the most part. There are, however, pockets of deep poverty and attendant crime scattered throughout the area. The school has long had a bad reputation in the more affluent sections of the district, and this is the only school that loses in

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

academic competition with parochial schools. Other problems in the school concern leadership, overcrowding, personnel changes and a general malaise towards education.

The physical plant of Meade is located in a large six acre tract of pasture land some two miles off a rural highway. The schools lies on a dead end street in a section of a country subdivision where the houses sit on two acre lots. There is a lack of zoning here and the lots are strewn with outbuilding and trailers as well as chicken yards and cattle pens. A gravel drive fronts the school, and cars are parked haphazardly with no thought given to safety or order. The playground, which has both concrete and lawn, extends all over the grounds and is dotted with a mixture of old and new equipment.

The brick structure with low roofed sprawling wings was built in 1960 and added to in 1974. It is easy to recognize the older part which has the exterior doors and large windows that were necessary before air conditioning. In the new wings there is only one small casement window in each room and no exterior doors. The rooms in the newer sections are open to large 15 foot wide corridors, which are kept very shiny and clean. This is the part where administrative offices and the cafeteria are located. In the older section these rooms have been turned into classrooms because there are 800 students in this K-4 school and space is at a premium.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The majority of the student body is white (60%) and 20% African-American. The remaining population is Asian, but there is a growing population of migrant farm workers in addition to the transient population pulled from the local race track. It is the presence of these last two groups of children which accounts for the lack of support for the school on the part of the upper middle class in the area surrounding Meade school.

None of the classrooms are very large, but they are as attractive as the teachers can make them. All are equipped with computers and the usual array of audio-visual equipment as well as teacher made displays on the large bulletin boards. The cafeteria contains a nook with a stage for plays and is located next to the administrative offices. Although the school has a rural atmosphere, the children look much like other children in the district, but the test scores here are very low. The curriculum is driven by test scores, and the children do no seem to be getting a well rounded education. There is intensive training in the three R's, but this does not translate into higher scores; however, the administration does not see this to be a failure of the curriculum and no changes are planned.

Mrs. Burnside, the principal, is an African-American woman in her mid forties who makes a great first impression on visitors from outside the district.. Originally a speech therapist, she speaks in well-articulated rounded tones which are greeted with suspicion by the African-American community, who do not trust her lack of either black or French dialect. She is very well dressed and spends

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

most of her time in the front office seldom venturing out more than once a day to walk down the halls before and after lunch. The local school board member visits the school on the average of three times a week to deal directly with the teacher and attempts to solve problems reported to him by parents.

Mrs. Burnside does not seem to do much other than talk on the phone to set up meetings which are held elsewhere. There have been many reports in the media on the sad situation at Meade, with Mrs. Polk named as part of the problem. Shrugging this criticism off, she states that she is an old fashioned principal, not a curriculum person or a numbers person, but is evident that she provides no leadership at all aside from showing up each day and sitting at her desk. This lack of direction begins with Mrs. Burnside who does not plan any moves toward restructuring while she retains the top position at Meade. This lack of leadership combined with a money crunch in the district, public perception of Meade as a poor school, and media antagonism must be remedied before any restructuring can be accomplished.

Survey Results

The results of the MANOVA comparing teacher responses to the ASRS or this school pair is shown in Table 5.8. The overall pattern of results is not consistent with the pattern of results of the statewide study (Table 4.1b). While the statewide results for all schools was significant at every component and at each level, the Longstreet District school pair produced only a significant

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

difference in the Governance/Decision-Making Component (F=4.11) at the teacher involvement level and the Budget/Finance Component on both the school (F=12.91) and teacher (F=32.35) level.

Table 5.8

School Pair # 5, Longstreet District
Summary of MANOVAs for Cluster of Dependent Variables, Broken Down by School Responsibility and Teacher Involvement

ITEM	Average Scores for Highly Restructured School (HRS)	Average Scores for Moderately Restructured School (MRS)	F Value	Significance Level
School Responsibility Budget/Finance(4)	10.63	7.62	12.91	p<.001
School Responsibility Governance(5)	13.00	11.85	2.34	n.s.
School Responsibility Curriculum(15)	36.75	35.38	0.53	n.s.
Teacher Involvement Budget/Finance(4)	7.75	4.15	32.35	p<.0001
Teacher Involvement Governance(5)	9.56	8.15	4.11	p<.05
Teacher Involvement Curriculum(15)	32.75	29.85	2.25	n.s.

Notes. See 4.1b
There were 42 teacher responses. 16 (HRS) teachers and 26 (HRS) teachers.

There is very little difference in the perceptions of the faculty at the Highly Restructured School (HRS) and the Moderately Restructured School (MRS) concerning the school's responsibility for Governance/Decision-Making ($\bar{x}$ =13.00, 11.85) and Curriculum/Instruction ($\bar{x}$ =36.75,35.38). The results of the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

teacher involvement in these two areas show a significant difference in only Governance/Decision-Making ($\bar{x}$ =9.56,8.15).

There is a difference in the Budget/Finance Component between these two schools. The HRS teachers reported that they were aware to a greater extent of the school's responsibility for the determination of the available funds and how they were to be spent than the teachers at the MRS. The teachers at the HRS

District Cross-Site Analysis

The five districts, previously examined in this chapter, are studied in this section with the use of cross-site analysis techniques. The analysis was formulated in order to detect patterns in the data from the different cases and involved both qualitative and quantitative data from the five pairs of schools. In order to reduce the data, the summary table was created to provide a focus for the ten comparisons. As was the case for the Wheeler comparison (See Table 5.4), the schools are compared on the following dimensions of contrast: district support, personnel involvement, organization structures, and the three components of restructuring (Budget/Finance, Governance/Decision-Making, Curriculum/Instruction). Subheadings under each dimension provide topics for focus and explanation of the larger headings.

Table 5.9 presents a summary of the strengths of the restructuring process at each of the ten schools, which were involved in restructuring with different

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

levels of success. Differences in the restructuring dimensions between the two Wheeler District schools will not be discussed, since they were the norm against which the other schools have been compared. This was illustrated in Table 5.4, and have already been discussed in a previous section of this chapter. A reading across Table 5.9 shows the ratings of the individual districts and schools. A reading down the columns in Table 5.9 shows the difference in restructuring dimensions between the schools in Wheeler, Jackson, Butler, Stuart, and Longstreet Districts, which are arranged in order of the pervasiveness of the restructuring effort.

District Support

As illustrated in Table 5.9, district support in Jackson District was "somewhat strong." The district did give autonomy to some of its schools, but not just to benefit the restructuring effort. Instead, the district used the norm of school autonomy to allow itself to be disassociated from certain schools and the problems they might have had, isolating these schools and creating a wide variance of restructuring. Although there was some support for the ideas of restructuring, Jackson District had pressing outside problems such as the political instability of the school board and superintendent, as well as constant monitoring by the federal courts over longterm desegregation lawsuits. Like Jackson, Butler District was "somewhat strong" in its support of individual schools, but there was

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Table 5.9

Summary of School Restructuring Strengths Districts/School Comparison

District Schools			Dimensions of Contrast								
			Personnel Involvement			Organizational Structures				Components of Restructuring	
	District Support		Teacher Commitment	Principal Leadership	Communication Network	Staff Development	Structural Learning Environment	Budget Finance	Government Decision Making	Curriculum Instruction
Wheeler	●	Pickett (HRS)	●	●	◗	●	◖	◗	●	●
		Sherman (MRS)	◗	●	◗	●	●	O	◖	●
Jackson	◖	McClellan (HRS)	●	●	◖	◖	◖	◖	◗	◖
		Johnson (MRS)	◖	◖	◗	◗	◗	O	◗	◗
Butler	◖	Lee (HRS)	●	●	●	◖	◖	◗	●	◖
		Grant (MRS)	◗	◖	◗	◗	O	O	◗	O
Stuart	◗	Hood (HRS)	◖	◖	◗	◗	◗	◗	◗	◗
		Pope (MRS)	◗	◗	◗	◗	O	◗	◗	◗
Longstreet	◗	Forrest (HRS)	◗	◖	◗	◖	◖	◗	◗	◖
		Meade (MRS)	O	O	O	O	O	O	O	◗

Strong = ●; Somewhat Strong = ◖; Somewhat Weak = ◗; Weak =O (HRS) = Highly Restructured School (MRS) = Moderately Restructured School

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

little districtwide focus on restructuring. It was left to the interest and strength of the individual principals to determine how much restructuring was accomplished at each school.

Stuart District and Longstreet District also supported individual schools who attempt to restructure, but there was no focus and little support for restructuring on the district level, which is illustrated as a "somewhat weak" ranking. Longstreet District granted each school control of federal funds allotted to it, but very little control over district funds. Although individuals at high levels in the two districts had interest in restructuring, they did not have the political clout to press for change from the top down. It was left to the principals to work for restructuring from the bottom up, at which time the district supported their efforts.

Personnel Involvement

The personnel involvement at the four districts being discussed is characterized as mixed, with the highly restructured schools' teachers and principals having a stronger commitment than the moderately restructured schools' personnel. Personnel at all eight schools were committed to helping students and improving education, but only at the highly restructured schools (McClellan, Lee, Hood, Forrest) did the personnel really understand the principles of restructuring. Because teachers and principals at the moderately restructured schools (Johnston, Grant, Pope, Meade) were unsure of what it

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

meant to restructure a school, they worked at change both unsuccessfully and in isolation.

Organizational Structures

Highly restructured schools had stronger organizational structures in place to facilitate change in staff development, communication network, and the structured learning environment than did moderately restructured schools (Refer to Table 5.9). In particular McClellan, Johnston, and Lee schools had "strong to somewhat strong" ratings, with Grant, Pope, and Meade schools rated "somewhat weak to weak" in these areas. The schools with strong ratings had a more sophisticated network of communication and the staff displayed a willingness to push harder for change. In these schools, the free exchange of ideas and information created a more restructured learning environment than was evident at the moderately restructured schools where the lines of communication were less clear. Meade rated weakest in the three parts of organizational structures in Table 5.9, because its undeveloped staff worked in traditional classrooms with very little support from the district and the administration.

Components of Restructuring

Budget/Finance

None of the schools in the four districts under discussion was given complete control of their own finances by their districts which prevented any of them from getting a high rating in the area of Budget/Finance. Only McClellan

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

School in Jackson District was given "somewhat strong" control over their school monies. This was due in part to the aggressive activism of the principal who demanded more control and had the political clout to get it. The principal at McClellan shared some of the decisions over budget with her faculty as did the principals at Lee, Hood, and Forrest schools, but on a more limited basis. The faculty at Johnston, Grant, and Meade schools had no control over the small amount of discretionary spending that the district granted to those principal as reflected in their "weak" rating in Table 5.9.

Governance/Decision Making

In the area of Governance/Decision-Making the ratings are mixed with Lee being given a "strong" rating for the ability of the faculty to share in all aspects of the operation of the school. The ratings in Butler District show the largest difference between paired schools, with Grant School having a "somewhat weak" rating because of the decision of the principal not to share information or decisions with her faculty. Both Stuart and Longstreet Districts provided little allowance for restructuring in who makes decisions and how things are done, with Meade School receiving "weak" rating, the only one in the table to be given that low rating. At Meade School the teachers worked in traditional isolated classrooms, with no chance to share or give suggestions as to how any changes should be made, partly because the principal was an ineffectual administrator and did not want her shortcomings questioned. The strong principal at McClelland

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

liked to keep control over what was going on and did not like to share decisions with her teachers which resulted in a "somewhat weak" rating in the category of governance and decision making.

Curriculum/Instruction

Table 5.9 contains ratings between "somewhat strong" to "weak" in the Curriculum/Instruction dimension of contrast. There were curriculum and instruction initiatives occurring at each of the eight schools to change the curriculum, but these met with varying degrees of success, and none of the eight schools here discussed received a "strong" rating. In all districts represented in the table, the highly restructured schools received a stronger rating that the moderately restructured schools, except the Stuart District in which both schools received a "somewhat weak" rating. Grant School in Butler District was the only school which rated "weak" in curriculum and instruction. The African-American centered curriculum proposed by Grant was never realized in any appreciable degree; therefore, the instruction at the school remained focused on traditional subject matter taught in the traditional manner.

Summary

The ten case study schools revealed large differences in the degree of restructuring accomplished in the districts chosen for this study in the areas of personnel involvement, organizational structures, and the components of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

restructuring. The distinguishing pattern indicates that the highly restructured schools rated stronger on the dimensions of contrast than did the moderately restructured schools. The highly restructured schools rated strongest in the area of personnel involvement, where strong leadership provided impetus and support for change. The leadership in most of the schools provided direction for change, but there were many reasons why these changes were not realized, and the status quo remained preferable to the trauma of monumental change in several schools. The least evidence of change is reflected in the Budget/Finance category, because either the district or the principal would not allow a sharing of decisions affecting monies at the school level.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Chapter 6
Conclusions and Implications

Overview of the Study

This study was designed to examine the existence of and the processes associated with highly and moderately restructured schools in Louisiana. These schools differential restructuring status was based first on reputational criteria and then confirmed by evidence from this study. The basic tenet of this study is that school restructuring is a specific type of change involving greater decision-making authority at the local level resulting in schools being more responsive, effective, flexible, and efficient in meeting the distinctive needs of its own particular context, student population, and community.

As noted above by numerous critics, restructuring has many different meanings to many different people. The criteria set forth in this study was explicit as to the definition and the elements of restructuring that were being investigated (i.e., the three components of restructuring). The degree of restructuring found in schools in the study was very diverse. At the upper end of the continuum were schools that were highly restructured, using any definition, while at the other end of the spectrum, restructuring efforts were hardly recognizable. As the case studies and cross-case analysis show, few schools in this study incorporated all, or even most, of the essential components of restructuring proposed by the literature and previous research.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Problems are encountered when school organizations try to change from the traditional top-down organizational structure to one grounded in local control and innovation. Chrispeels (1992) asserts that "traditional school structures have created ingrained cultures of isolation and self-reliance by teachers that limit teacher understanding of their school as an organization and make changes more difficult" (p.1). In this study, there were barriers and interference, that, together with a lack of understanding of the breadth of restructuring, kept many of the schools from achieving the goals they set for themselves. Some of the schools did not even have clear, concise goals or means for achieving them. Results from this study indicate that impediments to successful change are alleviated by the establishment of effective lines of communication, a collaborative enthusiasm for creatively meeting the needs of children, and a continuous, long-term mutual commitment.

This chapter begins with brief answers to the research questions posed in Chapter 1. The discussion then continues with the conclusions and implications for research.

Research Questions

The nine research questions are answered in the order that they were asked in Chapter 1. Two sets of questions are answered together (3 & 9, 7 & 8) because they are so closely associated and the answers are interrelated.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

1. "What districts in Louisiana are restructured based on the Three Components of Restructuring?"

There is little interest statewide in restructuring public elementary schools, even though state agencies give districts great latitude in decisions concerning their future plans. Although the state doesn't hinder efforts at restructuring, neither does it aggressively demonstrate a commitment to the idea of restructuring. Because the state does not mandate school restructuring, the districts are under no great pressure to decentralize decision-making or re-prioritize budget decisions, both of which are fundamental to the restructuring of schools.

"Louisiana's educational governance structure is a top-down approach, whereby local school boards and schools are responsible primarily for implementing state programs and policies" (McKenzie, Baldwin, & DeVille, 1992). There are sporadic efforts at site-based management being made across the state, but without the other prerequisites necessary for a true restructuring effort, there can be no holistic plan for change. "Restructuring schools, while redefining the roles and responsibilities of all involved, will be harder and more challenging than maintaining the status quo" (McKenzie, Baldwin, & DeVille, 1992, p. 44).

Because this was a statewide study, responses were solicited from each of the eight state regions, but only five district representatives felt that their districts

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

were qualified to participate in such a study, using the guidelines from the Three Components of Restructuring. There were more restructuring districts than those chosen for this study, but they were clustered in the southern part of the state, within regions already represented in the sample.

As a whole, this politically conservative state has educators who are traditionally oriented in their methods, and it is therefore, highly unlikely that many districts would become involved in an ambitious program such as restructuring their schools. Many school districts, including most rural districts from the norther part of the state, consider new educational practices to be "faddish" and resist such efforts (e.g., Teddlie & Stringfield, 1993). Most school districts are hesitant to decentralize control and even more reluctant to relinquish control of the budget, feeling that accountability resides in the purview of the central authority. This reticence of district administrators to relinquish control is facilitated by some teachers, who do not want leadership positions and the responsibility that comes with control.

Of the districts in this study, only Wheeler can be said to be truly restructured. That effort began as a vision of what it would take to convert an adequate system into one that better answered the needs of children in the twenty-first century. The Wheeler superintendent expressed the district's restructuring philosophy by stating that "the best way to make changes is by having a strong local push and district policies that support them." The policy for

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

successful change in Wheeler was explicit rather than implicit, meaning that it came from the top down as well as the bottom up. Restructuring was not forced on the schools by the district, nor did the schools alone lobby for radical change; they worked together to effect meaningful and lasting change.

The quality and amount of restructuring in the other districts depended mostly on the ability of the principal at an individual school to aggressively seek to try restructuring as a means of improving education. Jackson and Butler districts opened the way for restructuring, but given more critical problems, withdrew support for the idea, leaving pockets of uneven restructuring conducted by interested principals or other change agents.

Stuart District is an example of a system doing a "good" job educating its students, while also being deeply steeped in conservatism. Control in Stuart is still "district-centered" and site-based decision-making is not discouraged, but not vigorously encouraged. The members of the educational community in Stuart District know their roles and responsibilities and strive to fulfill their commitment to the district and its students. As long as the parents and the public are happy, the district authorities do not see the need to change a system which seems to be working well for them.

In Longstreet District, the restructuring effort has gone underground because of pressure from conservative religious groups in the community who have protested against it on "moral" grounds. What little restructuring has

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

happened there was part of a school improvement plan mandated by the federal government in order to receive Chapter I funds, and the term restructuring was little used by anyone in the system.

Often an educational community is fearful of change due to ignorance, but just as often because they feel negative toward change of any kind. The very word "restructuring" is a mechanical term which implies a connection with math or engineering, connotations which often invokes negativity and suspicion to the unsophisticated. If the process of restructuring could be called something more "warm and fuzzy", it is possible that more of it would have caught on in the schools throughout Longstreet District.

2. "Can schools be categorized according to the extent to which restructuring has occurred in each of the areas: (a) Budget/Finance-Fiscal Responsibility, (b) Governance/Decision-Making, and (c) Curriculum and Instruction?"

This study yielded several important conclusions concerning the components of restructuring. The development and validation of the Attributes of School Restructuring (ASRS) resulted in the confirmation of the instrument's ability to differentiate between restructuring efforts at the global level and within specific areas. The ASRS is a valid assessment instrument that is capable of distinguishing differentially successful school restructuring efforts based on teachers' perceptions. Reputational criteria also provided accurate assessments of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

the degree of restructuring, since they agreed substantially with the results from the ASRS. This is important because they are often the only assessment available concerning the success of restructuring efforts.

Teachers gave higher ratings to the items related to the school's overall role in restructuring than they gave to their own role. This indicates that they perceive that the school has more responsibility for and involvement in restructuring than teachers do. On the other hand, the teachers perceived greater differences in their personal involvement in restructuring across the two types of schools (highly, moderately restructured) than they did in the school's responsibility across those two types of schools. In statistical terms, the effect sizes were larger for the personal involvement items than for the school responsibility items. This means that highly restructured schools somehow got their teachers much more involved in the process than did moderately restructured schools.

The results were stronger for the items concerned with Budget and Governance issues than for those associated with Curriculum issues. The most consistently differentiating items were those associated with the Budget, especially those concerned with personal involvement in the budgetary process. This appears to be a case in which highly and moderately restructured schools are very different from one another, with the less restructured schools allowing their teachers almost no involvement in the budgeting process.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Almost all of the Governance items successfully differentiated between the two types of schools. It is interesting that the items that did not differentiate between highly and moderately restructured schools were those concerned with "establishing school governance (school councils, etc.)." This apparently occurred at a level above the school, probably the district.

There were fewer significant differences on the Curriculum issues, indicating that teachers did not perceive distinctions between the schools on several of those dimensions. Thus, highly restructured schools are not different from moderately restructured schools, according to their teachers, on issues such as determining assessment (school and personal level), establishing outcomes for students (school and personal level), determining the curriculum (school level), designing ways to teach (personal level), etc. These results are in line with recent research (e.g., Meza & Teddlie, 1996; Taylor & Teddlie, 1996) indicating that school reform efforts often do not touch the "instructional core" of a school.

3. "What is the nature of teacher and student work activities in schools that are highly restructured and moderately restructured? and 9. "What changes in classroom instruction and learning has occurred as a result of the school restructuring efforts?"

The ten schools in this study attempted restructuring with varying levels of intensity, and the resulting pattern of success was uneven and often disappointing. Although the restructuring effort took different forms, the central

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

idea was to create shared decision making at the school in order to enhance student achievement (David, 1996). The staff at each chosen school did want to improve education, and all schools did make some changes, but those who succeeded started with a broader vision of teachers and students working together in a new philosophy of learning (Shanker, 1990).

In the highly restructured schools there was a great enthusiasm and interaction among the students, the staff, and the community. The staff communicated their vision of education to parents, who embraced the ideas and encouraged their children by becoming more active in the school programs as volunteers. Teachers assigned tasks to parents such as planning field trips and demonstrating special skills, but some parents came up with ideas of their own.

Examples of changes due to restructuring were found throughout the case studies. Both schools in Jackson District were given a grant to improve the school libraries, which got the school communities involved on all levels. At McClellan, a group of fathers donated material and time to build additional space for reading. One parent in Johnston School, who is a very talented artist, spent several weeks painting murals in the library and (at her expense) building a book nook from a collaborative design, where children could enjoy free reading time. When the parents were invited to participate in the school as more than monitors, there was increased excitement among the children for what was going on at school and a desire to express their own ideas.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The children in these highly restructured schools felt pride in these shared activities and this was reflected in the enthusiasm they showed for their studies. Time on task (assessed informally) was much higher in these schools, and there was less disengagement of students, with few of the interruptions found in a traditional school day. Children in these schools remained for large blocks of time with the same teacher, which made for a less hectic and more settled schedule. Even if the physical space could not be rearranged, there was a reordering of the management of its use, such as grouping children with similar needs into certain areas to facilitate team teaching.

Teachers felt able to reorder priorities and make decisions allowing them more control over their daily lives, which in turn encouraged them to become more assertive teachers. Some teachers refused to get involved, not because they were against restructuring, but because they didn't know what to do or how to do it; however, on close observation, even those teachers did make some small and subtle changes.

Motivated teachers saw the need to leave their classroom and become involved with schoolwide issues. They recognized the significance of the grade-level meetings, curriculum committees, school site councils, and faculty meetings as vehicles for bringing about change, both at the school level and in their own classroom. These teachers did not rely on test data to make them initiate change,

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

since this data might be useful only in the short range, but the teachers used the scores as a guide to long term plans for restructuring.

4. " How much district support is given to the selected elementary schools?"

Overall district support was relatively high in the ten selected schools in the study. The schools were selected by the districts for inclusion in this study because the district representative felt a rapport with, and a pride in, what was taking place at these selected schools. They were chosen for a variety of reasons: a specific pilot program, the presence of a restructuring impetus (Accelerated Schools), aggressive leadership in some area, or a response to drastic change or need for problematic solutions. The districts provided as much support as was requested, but only Wheeler District established consistent and intense support which allowed for pervasive change.

In the other four districts, support for restructuring was uneven throughout, and for the most part "high" support was given lip service only, because of political and personal reasons. Although they could see the value in restructuring, some district administrators were reluctant to push it before the public, fearing it would cause too many problems, and require too much explanation. The central officials did not trust certain school administrations to handle the freedoms and responsibilities that come with restructuring and refused to empower those in whom they had no confidence.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Educational restructuring requires a "vision" of learning which is more complicated that the cliché which states that "all students can learn". In order to promote a true vision, each district must provide direction and a clear definition of exactly what help the district will provide and to what lengths it will go to help each school provide "restructured education." Aside from Wheeler, no district had an articulated mission statement which provided a basis for commitment and which extended to schools and to the community at large. In the cases of Jackson and Longstreet districts, where each school was required to produce a mission statement, the faculties at these schools did not know exactly why or how such a mission statement would affect them. The result was a mission statement that was merely words on the front of the school handbook or on a framed display by the front door, with no practical application in the school day.

The lack of a district game plan results in sporadic and halfhearted attempts to implement parts of school restructuring. Districts may have good communication with some of the schools, and may hold informative inservice training for teachers, but they do not carry it far enough to make a profound impact which would result in additional restructuring efforts. Other than Wheeler, districts in the state do not have a blueprint of an overall plan which would serve as a model for schools to construct the smaller plan to benefit their individual school community.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

These district level results are consistent with previous research conducted in the state. For example, Teddlie & Stringfield (1993) concluded the following from a ten-year longitudinal study of school effects:

> Across all LSES phases, we were struck by the lack of meaningful influence from the district offices on school effectiveness. In fact, the only influences we saw were negative and were of little import to overall school effectiveness. We... concluded that the major impact of districts concerns the absence of resources in economically disadvantaged areas, which places restrictions on the effectiveness status of schools in the district. (p.220)

Results from the current study are more positive than results from this previous research, which was conducted from 1982-92. Restructuring in Louisiana started in the early 1990s and the current study examined the most restructured districts, which could explain the somewhat more positive results found in this study.

5. "Are these restructuring efforts evident and important to the teachers within the schools?"

In order to have true restructuring in the school, teachers must have knowledge, training, and commitment to the process of change, because what matters most are skills, creative thinking, and committed action rather than mandates by policymakers (McLaughlin, 1990). Except for Wheeler District, none of the districts in the study were willing to spend the time or money encouraging teachers to develop the skills necessary (e.g., conflict resolution, problem-solving techniques, goal-setting) to achieve effective restructuring. In

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Longstreet District, the teachers had been thrust into a restructuring effort with little or no training in site-based management and with little knowledge of the process and its long-term impact. In addition, there was so much suspicion about restructuring in this district, that any teacher interested in pursuing the subject would have to use personal time to learn about it, with no assurance that such knowledge would ever be put to use.

Some ambitious teachers were eager to be recruited for a positions in a visionary atmosphere, and were attracted to restructured schools like Lee in Butler District, where they could have some voice beyond the classroom. Teachers whose schools were involved in restructuring generally knew something about the programs, and the more highly restructured the school was, the more the teachers there knew about how to effect change.

Teachers knew about restructuring programs that were happening in their classrooms, and very little about other changes taking place throughout the school. For instance, if a teacher was on the grade level committee, he or she might have little knowledge of what decisions were being made in other grades. The responses given by teachers when asked about various restructuring efforts, were often "I haven't been trained in that method, yet" or, "I'm not on that committee."

Teachers who are uninterested or unenthusiastic about restructuring reform are working in bubbles of isolation in traditional classrooms. Until the

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

seal around these teachers is broken, they will continue to be ignorant of the positive effects of restructuring and will continue to be powerless to bring about any of these changes. Even if some teachers are well-informed about students and their problems, giving teachers the power to make decisions does not mean that they will achieve real reform. To the individual teacher inside the classroom, true reform begins with knowledge of what to expect from restructuring, coupled with effective communication which provides support for the teacher's efforts.

The piecemeal approach to restructuring is evident in many of the moderately restructured schools in this study. Most of the innovations in these schools are based on the false assumption that teacher performance and, consequently, student learning will automatically improve with the implementation of these new techniques and strategies. Research concludes that instructional decisions must grow out of teachers' perceptions of need to be successful, and, unfortunately, many of the decisions for restructuring initiatives in this study were not made by the teachers in these schools. Teachers at most of the moderately restructured schools were unaware of the impetus to include programs in the school curriculum (e.g., literature-based reading grew out of the new text book adoption cycle). Because the changes did not originate with the teachers, they didn't know why they were changing.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Research indicates that "whole-school" professionalism and norms of collegiality begin to emerge when changes are made in organizational structures and the ways teachers work together to address these changes (Chrispeels, 1992). The successful schools in this study employed a staff development and training approach, that was context specific to the needs of the school which are powerful forces in building commitment among the staff. Those who took an active role in restructuring worked long hours and took on responsibilities that used to be the domain of the administration. Only in Wheeler District were teachers compensated for this extra work. Also in this district, release time was rearranged to aid the teacher. unlike other districts where the teacher had to get a substitute and often returned to chaos and extra work.

6. "What is the role of the principal in these restructuring efforts within their school?"

Berman & McLaughlin (1977) identify principals as critical actors in defining the beliefs, goals, and vision which shape schools, as well as in sustaining and shaping innovations during the implementation of such visions. Besides the faculty, principals direct many players in an active school (e.g., support staff, volunteers, visitors) and this creates an overwhelming multiplicity of tasks. For instance, the principal at Lee, Mrs. Hampton, had a walkie-talkie so that she could stay in constant touch with the different parts of the school community (e.g., custodial staff, secretarial staff, etc.).

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Principals who are committed to restructuring want to make the plan work and accept the leadership challenge it entails. These principals must also balance attention paid to the different actors: teachers, students, and the community. An effective principal knows that everyone associated with restructuring must perceive everyone around them to be working equally hard, without resentment, or the chance for success is lessened.

The principal, as the leader of the school, is the key player and the barometer of how the school restructuring is faring. Most of the principals in this study started with a small cadre of supportive teachers they knew or brought with them from other schools. As evidenced by the interviews, these principals fostered loyalty and professional development by delegating responsibility and accountability to selected personnel on the basis of ability, not favoritism. In Lee School, any teacher who proposed an idea was given support and guidance by the principal to follow the idea as far as could, without fear of what would happen if the idea did not succeed. In contrast to this, the principal at Meade School in Longstreet District had very limited contact with teachers and they did not feel comfortable asking her advice or making suggestions for improvements in the schools. Even in schools like Forrest, where the principal had overwhelming popular support, outside pressures (e.g. community poverty and uncontrolled crime) subverted the lofty goals set by the school and the administration.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

The administrator in each school is ultimately responsible for managing collaborative decision-making, a stressful role which requires diplomacy and sensitivity (Malen & Ogawa, 1988). The principals in this study worked long extra hours for which there was little if any monetary remuneration. For instance, the principal at Lee was planning to take a year's leave to finish her doctoral work, in order to keep up with changes which would further benefit her school. She felt confident that the faculty would be able to survive her absence, and would also look forward to her return.

The most successful principals in this study had an overriding commitment to their schools, and a true dedication to the philosophy of educating the whole child. No part of their professional career, (e.g., promotion, salary, or academic degrees), took precedence over their view of education as a higher calling, which would benefit their school in particular and society in general. The least successful principals in this study didn't have the intensity of commitment.

7. "What is the history of the school and district that supports and sustains the restructuring efforts?" and 8. "Where did the impetus come from for the restructuring effort?"

Except for Wheeler District, none of the other districts in the study have experienced a strong or lasting change from restructuring efforts. It is fair to say that these districts now have more knowledge about the nature of restructuring, and some limited exposure to the process, but longterm effects are uncertain.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Having at least experimented with a novel approach to the old problems of how to best teach children, these districts may retain something of value which they will keep for future use. Since other forces, both political and cultural, are at work in the districts, it is impossible to know which parts of the restructuring techniques will take hold and which will be discarded.

The impetus for change came from many sources in the different districts, and most of them had little to do with a desire to try restructuring for its own sake. In Jackson District, restructuring was part of a redesign plan proposed by the federal judge in a twenty year old desegregation suit. Stuart District tried to better an already good educational system and used restructuring as part of a modification plan. When a year round school was proposed for Butler District, it soon became evident that more severe restructuring would have to take place to accommodate an extended school calendar. Longstreet District was forced to try restructuring in order to receive federal money as part of a redesign plan demanded by the federal government. Once these changes had been agreed upon for whatever reason, the districts did support and sustain the schools in their restructuring ventures to a certain degree. The districts provided inservice training for teachers and administrators with experts who would help them get started. The districts tried to keep up effective communication with the schools, in order to answer questions, listen to problems, and obtain help when necessary.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Wheeler District is the only district which chose restructuring as a means to provide a new focus for the school system, whose population happened to be in flux from rural to suburban. Because new demands were being made on the system, a new program was needed which would be less traditional and more in keeping with the twenty-first century. The help provided by Wheeler District was neither shallow, nor was it only on paper. The district went all out to do everything it could to help prepare for the changes, which each school chose for itself. For example, Wheeler District allowed the school calendar to be revised and the year extended to include release days for teachers, in cases where the training in collaborative teaching techniques were required. Wheeler District is evidence of the sort of equity district noted in LaRocque and Coleman (1987) which, once committed to change, implemented it through discussion and monitoring, and provided continuing support through staff development.

Recommendations for Enhancing Restructuring

The 1992 LSDE study (McKenzie, Baldwin, & DeVille, 1992) made several recommendations for successful school restructuring in Louisiana, some of which were followed by the schools selected for this study. Similar recommendations emanate from this study, which are also supported by the recent restructuring literature (David, 1996; Fullan, 1993; Odden & Wohlstetter, 1995). These general recommendations are based on the need for a system that

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

will focus and implement a specific program of restructuring envisioned by both the district and the schools. Without such a focus, restructuring attempts become, like most education reforms, a scattered collection of local efforts (Elmore, 1988). In order to generate such a focus, there must be a concentrated sharing of information which encompasses players at both the school and district level.

Restructuring plans should begin at the top with an open-minded state administration eager to back local reform efforts with money and advice on how to put such a program into place. It is not enough for state officials to pay lip service to restructuring ideas, while looking the other way when districts do make any substantive effort. The state can play the role of a "bully pulpit" for educational reform and should be a power in promoting methods to better the state's public schools. Those officials in the state who support restructuring should nudge districts in the direction of site-based management in a subtle manner that would communicate the potential positive aspects of local reform efforts

The district can create a "menu" of different reform initiatives from which schools choose for themselves what will work best. The district must be willing to made substantive changes at both the school and district level if the restructuring is to be more than cosmetic. In the current study, Wheeler District stands as exemplary for district support of local school site reform efforts.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

In order for restructuring to occur, the superintendent must be secure of his/her position, and must have the confidence of the school board. The board members must be committed to the idea of restructuring and willing to face pressure by special interest groups and defenders of the status quo. Central office administrators must put aside politics and personal ambition in order to work with the board and individual schools.

Site-based management follows a larger trend of decentralizing central power and returning it to grass roots management. The district must provide a change strategy which consolidates local, state, and federal funds to support school efforts in achieving agreed upon goals (Fullan, 1993). The district must should also revamp the professional development and inservice programs to give both teachers and principals the skills that they will need in a new school environment (Elmore, 1988; David, 1990).

In any restructuring plan, it is essential for district officials to select a principal who can facilitate and manage the changes in the school's day to day operations and be willing to share power and information with teachers. Teddlie & Stringfield (1993) described the district role in this process as follows:

> The quickest way to engender improvement across a number of schools is the thoughtful matching of principals with schools by the central office... These changes can happen only in situations where the superintendent is aware of contextually sensitive school effects research, has restructured her or his office, has a talent pool from which to select leaders. Also, someone in the central office needs the personnel skills required to identify potential school leaders for different types of school. (p. 223)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

District officials must also be willing to allow their principals to ultimately call the shots at the school level, even if some principals have what has been called a "maverick" orientation (Levine & Lezotte, 1990). For instance, the two principals in Wheeler District contradicted suggested practice, which called for simultaneous implementation of the twelve components of restructuring. Both principals agreed that this approach was too much, too soon, and that the plan would work better if incrementally applied. The principals felt that phasing in the changes over five year period would allow for assimilation of changes into curriculum, instruction, and the methods of communication. If allowing principals true autonomy was necessary for successful reform in a small, relatively affluent district like Wheeler, then it must be even more so in large, urban areas which are confronted with critical funding problems, unstable political climates, and large differences in local school contexts.

Teachers need adequate time, information, and skills to create and adapt to new roles (e.g., Elmore, 1988; David, 1990). In Louisiana, the current school schedule makes it difficult for teachers to find the time to engage in restructuring activities, and this is especially the case in the elementary schools, where non-instructional time during the school day is very limited. Wheeler District revised the yearly school calendar to give teachers paid release time, and teachers were remunerated for all other after hours training. There are many ways to build in time for staff development and training opportunities for teachers, and state

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

authorities have been amenable to these revisions. An excellent alternative suggestion, proposed by, but not followed in Wheeler District, was to lengthen the school day and pay teachers accordingly. Mentor and lead teacher programs can be used as a means of providing leadership roles for teachers, and are often linked with salary incentives. Lead teachers work as mentors, consultants on textbook selection, curriculum development, and planning staff development.

A major lesson from this study and other studies (e.g., Chrispeels, 1992; Barth, 1990; Lieberman, 1986, 1988; Rosenholtz, 1989; Schlechty, 1990) is that teachers are often critical of the school improvement and restructuring process. The teachers norm of autonomy is often quite strong, especially in schools where chaotic conditions have existed. Teachers in such schools may opt to control their own classroom environments, preferring to leave school level change to administrators. Change agents should be aware of this tendency of some teachers and should allow them to "opt out" of the restructuring effort, as did the schools in Wheeler District, if attempts at inclusion become counterproductive.

Broad scale implementation of restructuring concepts require statutory and regulatory changes, which are not possible without the patience and commitment of the parents, faculty, and district staff. It is not surprising that few educators are willing to truly alter an entrenched system to make these new policies work. Louisiana schools have many problems, not the least of which is a reluctance to change the status quo. Nevertheless, by promoting restructuring, some systems

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

are discovering a new and open outlook immediately benefits the children currently in their care and strengthens the future of education.

Recommendations for successful change and prescriptive strategies to implement them have been widespread throughout the relatively short history of school restructuring literature. Many of the themes that emerged from the current study have been heard before: the need for collaboration and shared decision-making opportunities; the need to have a schoolwide focus, goals, and channels of communication; the need to regularly assess school programs and student progress; and the need for parental involvement. In summation these salient recommendations by levels are:

State

- Have a vision to grow - the beacon that guides effective restructuring
- Commitment to restructuring - say it, do it, mean it
- Allow waivers - be open-minded and trust districts to know what's best
- Make information available - reach out and share with every district
- Reward accomplishments - showcase the best and spotlight the rest

District

- Have a vision to grow - borrow or create it, but keep it in front
- Commitment to restructuring - patience is a virtue, practice it
- Disseminate information - you have it, they need it

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

- Provide time - make it, create it, spend it wisely
- Match principal to school - demands a real search, not a lottery or a prize,
- Disperse funds in lump sum - know and trust the principal
- Provide menu to schools - varied and rich, they will know what they like
- Reward accomplishments - do everything and this will happen by itself

Principals

- Have a vision to grow - reclaim idealism and let it lead you
- Commitment to Restructuring - start slowly and keep it coming
- Confidence in Faculty - choose wisely with an eye to the future
- Inform and train - lead them in right direction by words and actions
- Share power and encourage - the right faculty has the right ideas
- Include parents and community in planning - help is close at hand
- Choose from a district menu - if it's there, find it, if not, put it there
- Reward accomplishments - the offspring of support

Teachers

- Have a vision to grow - become a first year teacher all over again
- Share, get out of isolation - agoraphobics make poor teachers
- Be open to change - consider the alternative before saying no
- Volunteer as mentors, coaches - acting, not reacting, promotes power
- Communicate with parents and students - learn through listening

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Recommendations for Further Study

Methodological Lessons from the Current Study

Four major methodological lessons for further study based on the present research are: (1) utilize the best instrument or protocols; (2) consult multiple sources at different levels; (3) use qualitative and quantitative data sources; and (4) find the appropriate unit of analysis. Elaborated versions of these suggestions are listed below, as well as additional areas for further study.

(1) Utilize instruments or protocols that can capture the essence of restructuring efforts. The ASRS (Pol & Taylor, 1994) was such an instrument in the study of school restructuring in Louisiana, because it adequately distinguished between differentially restructured schools.

(2) Consult multiple sources at multiple levels (state, district, school site) before choosing the restructuring schools for your study. This study demonstrated that reputational criteria can be utilized, but triangulation of multiple data sources (e.g., Patton, 1990) should be used before selecting the final sample of restructuring schools.

(3) Utilize both quantitative and qualitative data sources. In this study they complemented one another, but in other studies they may provide useful, discordant information. The qualitative case study data was required to answer the majority of the research qualitative questions in this study (question three through nine), but the quantitative data confirmed differential restructuring

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

success and pointed out the general areas of greatest difference between moderately and highly successful schools.

(4) Concentrate studies of restructuring at multiple levels (district, school, teacher). The school is the appropriate unit of analysis for restructuring studies, but the levels of district and teacher must also be examined.

Areas for Further Study

- Conduct longitudinal studies of school restructuring for a better understanding of how successful efforts at the district or school level evolve and are sustained.
- Conduct more in-depth studies of successful and unsuccessful district level efforts at restructuring, to better understand the conditions necessary for success at the district level. More research may deepen an understanding of how the process works.
- Conduct additional studies of professional development in successfully restructured schools to find out how they are organized , implemented, and transferred to all members. School-based and district staff development management are integral parts of successful restructuring. Another aspect of professional training is concerned with non-staff members who work in new roles in successful schools.
- Study teacher behavior in the classrooms in more depth (e.g., time on task, classroom climate for learning) to determine the impact of

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

restructuring on the "learning core" of the school. Spend more time in the classroom observing how the teaching and learning process is impacted by restructuring efforts.

- Conduct studies of leadership in successful restructured schools. In a restructured school, traditional leadership is replaced by "layered leadership" (Cheng, 1996). The term indicates that layers of authority have been peeled away and given to others. The investigation into these relationships could provide additional meaning to the understanding of shared leadership.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

References

Anastasi, A. (1982). Psychological testing. (5th ed.) New York: Macmillan Publishing.

Anderson, R. D., (1995, September). Curriculum reform: Dilemmas and promise. Phi Delta Kappan, 77(1), 33-35.

Archbald, D. (1993). Restructuring in the eyes of practitioners: An analysis of next century' school restructuring proposals. International Journal of Educational Reform, 2(4), 384-398.

Bacchus, M., & Marchiafava, B. (1991, April). Implementing school reform in Chicago: The system perspective. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 331 887)

Bacharach, S. B., Bauer, S.C., & Shedd, J. B.. (1986). The learning workplaces: The conditions and resources of teaching. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 279 614)

Bailey, William. (1992). Power to the schools - school leader's guidebook to restructuring. Newbury Park, CA: Corwin Press, Inc.

Banathy, B. A. (1991). System design of education: A journey to create the future. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Educational Technology Publications.

Barth, R. S. (1990). Improving schools from within: Teachers, parents, and principals can make the difference. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Bass, B. M. (1985). Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press.

Bennis, W. G. (1984). Transformative power and leadership. In Sergiovanni, T. J. and Corbally, J. E. (Eds.), Leadership and organizational culture (pp. 64-71). Chicago, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Bennis, W. G., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders: The strategies for taking charge. New York: Harper and Row.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Berman, P., & McLaughlin, M. (1977). Federal programs supporting educational change, Vol. VII: Factors affecting implementation and continuation. Santa Monica, CA: Rand.

Blake, R. G., & Mouton, J. S. (1985). The new managerial grid, III. Houston, TX: Gulf Printing.

Blumberg, A., & Greenfield, W. (1980). The effective principal: Perspectives on school leadership. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bogotch, I., Brooks, C. R., Riedlinger, B. A. , & MacPhee, B. C. (1992, April). Linking school level innovations with an urban district's central office. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Boles, K. C. (1990). School restructuring: A case study in teacher empowerment. (Occasional Paper No. 4.), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.: The National Center for Educational Leadership.

Boyd, W. L. (1987). Public education's last hurrah? Schizophrenia, amnesia, and ignorance in school politics. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 9(2), 85-100.

Borg, W. R., & Gall, M.D. (1989). Educational research: An introduction. New York: Longman.

Brandt, R. (1990). On restructuring schools: A conversation with Al Shanker. Educational Leadership, 47(7), 11-16.

Bredson, P. V. (1993, February). Letting go of outlived professional identities: A study of role transition and role strain for principals in restructured schools. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29(1), 34-68.

Brophy, J., & Good, T. (1986). Teacher behavior and student achievement. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching (pp. 328-375). New York: Macmillian.

Brown, D. J. (1990). Decentralization and school-based management. London: Falmer Press.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

CCSSO. (1990). Restructuring learning for all students. Washington, DC: Author. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 333 550)

Caldwell, B. J., & Spinks, J. M. (1988). The self-managing school. London: Falmer Press.

Caldwell, B. J., & Spinks, J. M. (1992). Leading the self-managing school. London: Falmer Press.

Carnegie Forum on Education and the Economy. (1986). A nation prepared for the 21st Century. (Report of the Task Force on Teaching as a Profession), New York: Carnegie Corporation.

Chapman, J. D. (Ed.) (1990). School-based decision making and management. London: Falmer Press.

Cheng, Y. C. (1993, April). The strength of principal's leadership: The structural, political, symbolic, and educational dimension. Occasional Paper No. 20), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, National Center for Educational Leadership, pp. 1-24.

Cheng, Y. C. (1996). School effectiveness & school-based management: A mechanism for development. London: Falmer Press.

Chrispeels, J. H. (1987). District leadership in parent involvement: Policies and actions in San Diego. Phi Delta Kappan, 72(5), 367-71.

Chrispeels, J. H. (1992). Purposeful restructuring: Creating a culture for learning and achievement in elementary schools. Washington, DC: Falmer Press.

Chrispeels, J. H., & Pollack, S. (1989). Equity schools and equity district. In Creemers, B.P.M., Peters, T. & Reynolds, D. (Eds.), School Effectiveness and School Improvement (pp. 295-308). Amsterdam, The Netherlands: Swets and Zeitlinger.

Chubb, J. E. (1988, Winter). Why the current wave of school reform will fall. Public Interest, 90, 28-49.

Chubb, J. E., & Moe, J. M. (1990). Politics, markets and America's school. Washington, D.C.: The Brookings Institution.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Clark, D. L., Lotto, L. S., & Ashuto, T. A. (1984, Summer). Effective schools and school improvement: A comparative analysis of two lines of inquiry. Educational Administration Quarterly, 20(3), 41-68.

Clune, W. H., & White, P. A. (1988). School based management: Institutional variation, implementation, and issues for further research. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute for Politics, Rutgers University.

Cohen, M. (1990). Restructuring the education system: Agenda for the 1990's. Washington, D.C.: Center for Policy Research, National Governor's Association.

Coleman, J. S., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, R., York, R. (1966). Equity of educational opportunity. Washington, D. C.: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Conley, D. (Spring, 1991). What is restructuring? Educators adapt to a changing world. Equity and Choice, 7(2-3), 46-51.

Conley, D. (1993, January). Restructuring: In search of a definition. Principal, 72(3), 12-16.

Conley, S. C., & Bacharach, S. B. (1990). From school-site management to participatory school-site management. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(7), 539-544.

Conley, S. C., Schmidle, T., & Shedd, J. B. (1988). Teacher participation in the management of school systems. Teachers College Record, 90 (2), 259-280.

Corbett, H. D. (1990). On the meaning of restructuring. Philadelphia, PA: Research for Better School.

Crocker, L., & Algina, J. (1986). Introduction to classical and modern test theory. New York: Holt, Rhinehart, & Winston

Cuban, L. (1990, January). Reforming again, again and again. Educational Researcher, 19(1), 3-31.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Ascher, C. (1991). Creating accountability in big city school systems. New York: National Center for Restructuring Education.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Darling-Hammond, L., & Berry, B. (1988). The evolution of teacher policy. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

David, J. L. (1989). Synthesis of research on school-based management. Educational Leadership, 46(8), 45-53.

David, J.L. (1990). Restructuring in progress: Lessons from pioneering districts. In R. Elmore (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 209-250). San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

David, J. L. (1996, January). The who, what, and why of site-based management. Educational Leadership, 53(4), 4-9.

David, J. L., Cohen, M., Honetschlager, D., & Traiman, S. (1990). State actions to restructure schools: First steps. Washington, D.C.: Center for Policy Research, National Governors' Association.

Denzin, N. K. (1970). The research act in sociology. London: Butterworths.

DeVillis, R. F. (1991). Scale development: Theory and applications. Newbury Park, CA: SAGE Publications.

Dimmock, C. (Ed.) (1993). School-based management and school effectiveness. London: Routledge.

Edmonds, R. R. (1979). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37(10), 15-24.

Elmore, R. (1979-80). Backward mapping: Implementation research and policy decisions. Political Science Quarterly, 94, 601-616.

Elmore, R. (1983). Complexity and control: What legislators and administrators can do about implementing public policy. In Schulman, L.S. & G. Sykes (Eds.), Handbook of teaching and policy (pp. 342-469). New York: Longman.

Elmore, R. (1988). Early experiences in restructuring schools: Voices from the field. Washington, DC: Center for Policy Research, National Governor's Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 306 634)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Elmore, R. (1990). Working models of choice in public education. New Brunswick, NJ: Center for Policy Research in Education, Eagleton Institute of Politics, Rutgers, The State University of New Jersey.

Elmore, R. (1992, April). "Why restructuring alone won't improve teaching." Educational Leadership, 49(7), 44-52.

Elmore, R., & Associates. (1991). Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform. San Francisco: CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Elmore, R., & McLaughlin, M. (1988). Steady work: Policy, practice, and the reform of American education. Santa Monica, CA: RAND Corporation.

English, F. W., & Hill, J. C. (1990). Restructuring: The principal and curriculum change. Reston, VA: National Association of Secondary School Principals. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 320 257)

Ericson, D. P., & Ellett, F. S. (1989). The question of the student in educational reform. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Fiedler, F. E. (1971). Validation and extension of the contingency model of leadership effectiveness: A review of empirical findings. Psychological Bullentin, 76, 128-48.

Floden, R. E., Goertz, M. E., & O'Day, J. (1995, September). Capacity building in systemic reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 77(1), 19-22.

Fullan, M. (1982). The meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Fullan, M. (1990). Staff development, innovation, and institutional development. In Joyce, B. (Ed.), Changing school culture through staff development, 3-25. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Fullan, M. (1991). The new meaning of educational change. New York: Teachers College Press.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Fullan, M. (1992). Innovation, reform, and restructuring strategies. In Cawelti, G. (Ed.), Challenges and achievements of American education, ASCD.

Fullan, M. (1993). Change forces: Probing the depths of educational reform. London: Falmer Press.

Fullan, M., & Miles, M. (1992, June). Getting reform right: What works and what doesn't. Phi Delta Kappan, 73(10, 744-756.

Fullan, M., Miles, M., & Taylor, G. (1978, August). OD in Schools: The State of the Art, Volume I: Introduction and Executive Summary. Final report to the National Institute of Education. Toronto: Ontario Institute for Studies in Education.

Glickman, C. (1993, January). Restructuring policy for America's schools. NASSP Bullentin, 76(549), 87-97.

Goetz, J. P., & LeCompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and Qualitative Design in Educational Research. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Goodlad, J. I. 1970). The reconstruction of teacher education. Teachers College Record, 72(1), 61-72.

Goodlad, J. I. (1975). The dynamics of educational change: Toward responsive schools. New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school: Prospects for the future. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Goodlad, J. I., Klein, M., & Associates. (1970). Behind the classroom door. Worthington, Ohio: Charles A. Jones.

Goldman, P., Dunlap, D. M., & Conley, D. T. (1991, April). Administrative facilitation and site-based school reform projects. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 332 334)

Guthrie, J. W. (1986). School-based management: The next needed education reform. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(4), 305-309.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1984). Analyzing what change facilitators do. Knowledge: Creation, diffusion, utilization. 5(3), 275-307.

Hall, G. E., & Hord, S. M. (1986). Configurations of school-based leadership teams. Austin, TX: Research and Development Center for Teacher Education.

Hall, G. E. & Hord, S. M. (1987). Change in school: Facilitating the process. Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Hall, G. E., Wallace, R. C., & Dossett, W. A. (1973). A developmental conceptualization of the adoption process within educational institutions. (Report No. 3006), Austin, TX: The University of Texas at Austin, Research and Development Center for Teacher Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 095 126)

Hallinger, P., & Murphy, J. F. (1987). Assessing and developing principal instructional leadership. Educational Leadership, 45(1), 54-61.

Hallinger, P., Murphy, J. F., & Hausman, C. (1992). Restructuring schools: Principals' perceptions of fundamental educational reform. (Occasional Paper No. 16), Cambridge, MA: Harvard University, National Center for Educational Leadership.

Hallinger, P., & Yanofsky, S. (1990). Gearing up to change slowly: Restructuring roles and relationships and the district level. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Halpin, A. W. (1966). Theory and research in administration. New York, NY: Macmillan.

Hansen, J. H., & Liftin, E. (1991). School restructuring: A practitioner's guide. Seampscott, MA: Watersun.

Hanson, E. M. (1991). Educational restructuring in the USA: Movements of the 1980's. Journal of Educational Administration, 29(4), 30-38.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Hargesheimer, D., & Others. (1988). Restructuring schools: The second wave of education reform. An LR391 Staff Report to the Education Committee. Nebraska Legislative Council, Lincoln, NE: Legislative Research Division.

Harvey, G., & Crandall, D. P (1988). What restructuring is: In search of a definition. Andover, MA: Regional Laboratory for Educational Improvement. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 315 918)

Heck, S., Stiegelbauer, S.M., Hall, G. E., & Loucks, S. F. (1984). Measuring innovation configurations: Procedures and applications. R & D Report No. 3108, Distributed by the Southwest Educational Development Laboratory, Austin, TX.

Hentschke, G. C. (1988). Budgetary theory and reality: A microview. In David H. Monk and Julie Underwood, (Eds.), Microlevel school finance: Issues and implications for policy (pp. 311-336). Cambridge, MA: Ballinger.

Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1972). Management of organizational behavior: Utilizing human resources. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

The Holmes Group. (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: The Holmes Group, Inc.

Hord, S. M., Rutherford, W. L., Huling-Austin, L., & Hall, G. E. (1987). Taking Charge of Change. Austin, TX: Southwest Educational Development Laboratory.

House, R. J. (1971). A path goal theory of leadership effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly, 16, 321-28.

Huck, S. W., & Cormier, W. H. (1996). Reading statistics and research. New York, NY: HarperCollins College Publishers.

Jick, T. (1983). Mixing qualitative methods: Triangulation in action. In Van Maanen, J. (Ed.), Qualitative methodology. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Johnson, Jr., B. L. (1990). The logic of school restructuring: A conceptual analysis. Journal of Thought, 25 (3-4), 67-92.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Johnson, S. M. (1991). Redesigning teachers' work. In Elmore, R. F. (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 125-151). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Joyce, B. (1991). The doors to school improvement. Educational Leadership, 48 (8), 59-62.

Keedy, J. L., & Finch, A. M. (1994). Examining teacher-principal empowerment: An analysis of power. Journal of Research and Development in Education , 27(3), 162-175.

Koppich, J. E. Brown, P., & Amsler, M. (1990). Redefining teacher work roles: Prospects and possibilities. San Francisco: Far West Laboratory for Educational Research and Development. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 326 930)

La Rocque, R., & Coleman, P. (1987). Leadership and commitment to change in school districts. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Washington, D.C.

Levine, D. U., & Lezotte, L. W. (1990). Unusually effective schools: A review and analysis of research and practice. Madison, WI: The National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development.

Lezotte, L. W. (1990). Lessons learned. In B. O. Taylor (Ed.), Case studies in effective schools research (pp. 195-199). Madison, WI: National Center for Effective Schools Research and Development.

Liebermann, A. (Ed.). (1990). School as collaborative cultures: Creating the future now. New York: Falmer Press.

Liebermann, A., & Miller, L. (1990, June). Restructuring schools: What matters and what works. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(10), 759-764.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). Naturalistic inquiry. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Lindelow, J. (1981). School-based management. Burlingame, CA: Foundation for Educational Administration.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Louis, K. S., & Miles, M. B. (1990). Improving the urban high school. New York: Teachers College Press.

McLaughlin, M. (1990, December). The Rand change agent study revisited: Macro perspectives and micro realities. Educational Researcher, 19, 11-16.

McKenzie, L. S., Baldwin, B., & DeVille, J. (1992). Restructuring schools. Baton Rouge, LA: Louisiana State Department of Education.

Malen, B., & Ogawa, R. (1988). Professional-patron influence on site-based governance councils: A confounding case study. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 10(4), 251-270.

Malen, B., Ogawa, R., & Kranz, J. (1990). What do we know about school based management? A case study of the literature - A call for research. In Clune, W. H., & Witte, J. F. (Eds.), Choice and control in American education, Volume 2, The practice of choice, decentralization, and school Restructuring (pp. 289-342). Bristol, PA: Falmer Press.

Maxcy, S. J. (1995). Democracy, chaos, and the new school order. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Meza, J., & Teddlie, C. (1996). An examination of differential teacher effectiveness in two restructuring schools. Journal of Education for Students Placed at Risk.

Miles, M., & Ekholm, M. (1991, April). Will new structures stay restructured? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 332 302)

Mitchell, D. & Beach, S. (1993, May). School restructuring: The superintendent's view. Educational Administration Quarterly, 29(2), 249-274.

Mohrman, S. A., & Cummings, T. G. (1989). Self designing organizations: Learning how to create high performance. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Mohrman, S. A., & Wohlsetter, P. and Associates (Eds.) (1994). School -based management: Organizing for high performance. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Moore, H., & Egermeier, J. (1986). Educational restructuring and school improvement. Paper presented for discussion at the forum, "The difference between school improvement and restructuring," at the Illinois Association for Research and Evaluation Conference, Restructuring Schools. Peoria, IL.

Moses, M. C., & Whitaker, K. S. (1990, September). Ten components for restructuring schools. The School Administrator, 32-34.

Muncey, D. E. (1994). Individual and schoolwide change in eight coalition schools: Findings from a longitudinal ethnographic study. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New Orleans.

Murphy, J. F. (1990, April). Effective schools: Legacy and future directions. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston.

Murphy, J. F. (1991). Restructuring schools - Capturing and assessing the phenomena. Columbia, NY: Teachers College Press.

Murphy, J. F., Everston C., & Radnofsky, M. (1991). Restructuring schools: Fourteen elementary and secondary teachers' perspectives on reform. Elementary School Journal, 92(2), 135-148.

Murphy, J. F., Peterson, K. D., & Hallinger, P. (1986). The administrative control of principals in effective school district: The supervision and function. The Urban Review, 18(3), 149-175.

National Commission on Excellence in Education. (1983). A nation at risk: The imperative for educational reform. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office.

National Governors' Association. (1986). A time for results. Washington, D.C.: National Governors' Association.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Newmann, F. (1993, January). What is a restructured school? Principal, 72(3), 5-8.

Newmann, F., & Others. (1989). Organizational factors that affect school sense of efficacy, community, and expectations. Sociology of Education, 62(4), 221-28.

Odden, A. R. (1992). Rethinking school finance: An agenda for the 1990's. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass, Inc.

Odden, A. R., & Marsh, D. (1988). How comprehensive reform legislation can improve secondary schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 68(8), 593-598.

Odden, A. R., & Picus, L. O. (1992). School finance: A policy perspective. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Odden, E. R., & Wohlstetter, P. (1995, February). Making school-based management work. Educational Leadership, 52(5), 32-38.

Odden, A. R., Wohlstetter, P., & Odden, E. R. (1995, May). Key issues in effective site-based management. School Business Affairs, 61(5),4-16.

Ogawa, R. (1995). (Ed.). School restructuring. Greenwich, CN: JAI Press.

Pascale, R. (1990). Meaning on the edge. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative evaluation and research methods. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Peters, T. J., & Waterman, R. H. (1982). In search of excellence. New York : Harper and Row.

Pol, S., & Taylor, D. (1994). Attributes of school restructuring scale.

Popham, W. J. (1988). Educational evaluation. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Popkewitz, T. S., & Lind, K. (1989, Summer). Teacher incentives as reforms: Teachers' work and the changing control mechanism in education. Teacher College Record, 90(4), 555-594.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Pristine, N. A., & Bowen, C. (1993). Benchmarks of change: Assessing essential school restructuring school efforts. Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis, 15(3), 298-319.

Radnofsky, M. L., Evertson, C. M., & Murphy, J. (1990, April). Restructured schools, tracking classroom effects: Teachers' perceptions. Paper presented at the meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston, MA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 324 800)

Rosenholtz, S. J. (1989). Teachers' workplace. New York: Longman.

Rosenshine, B. (1983). Teaching functions in instructional programs. Elementary School Journal, 83, 335-351.

Rowan, B. (1990). Applying conceptions of teaching to organizational reform. In R. F. Elmore (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 31-58). San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Rowley, S. R. (1991, October). A new mindset for restructuring schools. NASSP Bullentin, 75(537), 28-32.

SAS Institute Inc. (1985). SAS User's Guide: Basics, Version 5 edition. Cary, NC: Author.

Schein, E. H. (1992). Organizational culture and leadership. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Schlechty, P. C. (1988). Leading cultural change: The CMS case. In Lieberman, A. (Ed.), Building a professional culture in change (185-221. New York, NY: Teachers College Press.

Schlechty, P. C. (1990). Schools for the twenty-first century: The conditions for invention. The JCPS/Gheens Professional Development Academy. Louisville, KY.

Schwab, J. (1969). The practical: A language for curriculum. School Review, 78(1), 1-23.

Sergiovanni, T. J. (1984). Leadership and excellence in schooling. Educational Leadership, 41(5), 4-13.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Shanker, A. (1990). Staff development and the restructured school. In Joyce, B. (Ed.), Changing school culture through staff development (pp.91-103). Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Short, P.M., Rinehart, J. S., & Eckley, M. (1996). The relationship of teacher empowerment and principal leadership orientation. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, New York.

Sizer, T. (1984). Horace's compromise. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Slater, R. O., & Teddlie, C. (1993). A theory of school effectiveness and leadership. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 3(4), 242-257.

Smith, M., & O'Day. (1990). Systemic school reform. In Furham, S & B. Malen (Eds.), The politics of curriculum and testing (pp. 233-267). Philadelphia, PA: Falmer Press.

Smirchich, L. (1983). Concepts of culture and organizational analysis. Administrative Science Quarterly, 28(3), 339-58.

Spradley, J. P . (1979). The ethnographic interview, New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Spradley, J. P. (1980). Participant observation. Fort Worth, TX: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovich College Publishers.

Stogdill, R. M. (1974). Handbook of leadership. New York, NY: Free Press.

Stringfield, S. (1995). Attempting to enhance students' learning through innovative programs: The case for school's evolving into high reliability organizations. School Effectiveness and School Improvement, 7(1), 67-96.

Swap, S. M. (1991). Can parent involvement lead to increased achievement in urban schools? Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Boston. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 333 079)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Sykes, G. (1991). Fostering teacher professionalism in schools. In Elmore, R. (Ed.), Restructuring schools: The next generation of educational reform (pp. 59-96). San Francisco: CA: Jossey-Bass Publishers.

Taylor, D.L. (1992). Restructuring in an urban setting: How one elementary school got started. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Association for Supervision and Curriculum and Development, New Orleans, LA.

Taylor, D.L., & Teddlie, C. (1992). Restructuring and the classroom: A view from a reform district. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco.

Taylor, D. L., & Teddlie, C. (Submitted for publication, 1996). Restructuring without changing: Constancy in the classroom in a restructured district. Educational Administration Quarterly.

Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (1993). Schools Make a Difference. Columbia, NY: Teachers College Press.

Teddlie, C., Virgilio, I., & Oescher, J. (1990). Development and validation of the Virgilio teacher behavior inventory. Educational and Psychological Measurement, 50(2), 421-430.

Tewel, Kenneth. (1992, April). Preparing for restructuring: A step-by step approach to building support. NASSP Bullentin, 76(543), 103-113.

Tichy, N. M., & Ulrich, D. (1984). The leadership challenge: A call for the transformational leader. Sloan Management Review, 26(1), 59-68.

Timar, T. (1989, December). The politics of school restructuring. Phi Delta Kappan, 71(4), 265-275.

Tye, K.A. (1992, September). Restructuring our schools: Beyond the rhetoric. Phi Delta Kappan, 74(1), 9-14.

What is working in education: A symposium. (1990). Washington, DC: House Committee on Education and Labor. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 328 996)

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Wimpelberg, R. K., Teddlie, C., & Stringfield, S. (1989). Sensitivity to context: The past and future of effective schools research. Educational Administration Quarterly, 25(1), 82-107.

Wohlstetter, P. (1995, September). Getting school-based management right: What works and what doesn't. Phi Delta Kappan, 77(1), 22-26.

Wohlstetter, P., & Buffett, T. (1992). Decentralizing dollars under school-based management: Have policies changed? Educational Policy, 6(1), 35-54

Wohlstetter, P., & Odden, A. (1992, November). Rethinking school-based management policy and research. Educational Administration Quarterly, 28(4), 529-549.

Yin, R. K. (1989). Case Study Research: Design and Methods. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications.

Zaleznik, A. (1977). Managers and leaders: Are they different? Harvard Business Review, 55(5), 67-80.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix 1
Attributes of School Restructuring Scale (ASRS)

1. Please respond to each item in two ways. First, circle the number that best describes the amount of responsibility *your school* has for each item (Circle DK if you Don't Know). Second, circle the number that best describes your *personal involvement* in the decisions.

1 = None at All
2 = Some
3 = Great Deal

Example

In Item A, the respondent indicated that his/her school has SOME RESPONSIBILITY for setting budget priorities, and s/he has a GREAT DEAL of personal involvement in setting those priorities. In Item B, the respondent circled DON'T KNOW, indicating that s/he does not know whether the hiring support staff component applies to his/her school; therefore, the School Responsibility and Personal Involvement columns were not completed.

Component		Don't *Know*	School *Responsibility*	Personal *Involvement*
A.	Setting budget priorities	DK	1 (2) 3	1 2 (3)
B.	Hiring staff	(DK)	1 2 3	1 2 3
			1 = None at All 2 = Some 3 = Great Deal	1 = None at All 2 = Some 3 = Great Deal

How much responsibility does your school have for: How much personal involvement do you have for:		Don't Know	School Responsibility	Personal Involvement
A. 1, 2	Setting budget priorities	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
B. 3, 4	Hiring staff	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
C. 5, 6	Deciding faculty assignments	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
D. 7, 8	Finding alternative sources of funds	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
E. 9, 10	Deciding how school funds are spent	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
F. 11, 12	Establishing school governance procedures (school councils, etc.)	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
G. 13, 14	Promoting school wide decision-making	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
H. 15, 16	Involving parents in the school	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
I. 17, 18	Involving community/industry in the school	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
J. 19, 20	Arranging the school weekly schedule	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
K. 21, 22	Arranging the school yearly schedule	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
L. 23, 24	Arranging the student daily schedule	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
M. 25, 26	Arranging the teacher daily schedule	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
N. 27, 28	Implementing new roles for teachers (mentor, coach, etc.)	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
O. 29, 30	Creating special programs (computer, science programs, etc.)	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

3 How much responsibility does your school have for:
How much personal involvement do you have for:

1 = None at All
2 = Some
3 = Great Deal

Component	Don't Know	School Responsibility	Personal Involvement
P 31, 32 Determining the curriculum	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
Q 33,34 Selecting professional development	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
R 35, 36 Developing parent programs	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
S 37,38 Designing ways teachers teach	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
T 39,40 Organizing students for learning(grade,class,etc.)	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
U 41,42 Establishing student discipline procedures	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
V 43,44 Establishing outcomes for students	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
W 45,46 Creating climate/culture of the classroom	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3
X 47,48 Determining assessment practices	DK	1 2 3	1 2 3

2. There are many ways in which teachers can be involved in making decisions within a school. Please circle the ways you have been involved in decision-making in your school and district. Circle ALL THAT APPLY.

A. District-level committees
B. School committees
C. Grade-level meetings
D. Individually assigned responsibility
E. Informal conversation with principal
F. Site-based council

Please answer the following items by circling the appropriate response.

Ethnicity:
1. Black
2. Hispanic
3. White
4. Other (specify) _____

Gender:
1. Male
2. Female

How many years of teaching experience do you have?
1. 0 - 3
2. 4 - 9
3. 10 - 14
4. 15 - 19
5. 20 - 24
6. 25 - 30
7. 31 +

What is your highest degree?
1. Bachelors
2. Masters
3. Master's +30
4. Specialist
5. Doctorate

How many years have you been at this school?
1. 0 - 1
2. 2 - 5
3. 6 - 10
4. 11 - 15
5. 16 - 20
6. 21 - 25
7. 26 +

What grade level do you currently teach?
1. Preschool
2. Kindergarten
3. 1
4. 2
5. 3
6. 4
7. 5
8. 6
9. Other(specify)_____

Do you have a major responsibility at your school other than regular classroom teaching? If so, please circle ALL THAT APPLY?
1. None
2. Lead teacher
3. Grade-level chairperson
4. Mentor teacher
5. Other

OPTIONAL

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix 2
LSDE Restructuring Schools Survey

1. Relative to the concept of "Restructuring Schools", are there any programs within your state which may fall under the following categories:

a. Fiscal Restructuring	__ Yes	__ No
b. Governance Structure (Principal and Teacher Empowerment)	__ Yes	__ No
c. Parent Involvement	__ Yes	__ No
d. School Choice	__ Yes	__ No
e. School/Industry Collaboration	__ Yes	__ No
f. Site-based Management	__ Yes	__ No
g. Innovative Curriculum Redesign	__ Yes	__ No
h. Reorganization of the School Calendar	__ Yes	__ No
i. Innovative uses of Educational Technology	__ Yes	__ No
j. Social Services for Children (Integrated with school)	__ Yes	__ No
k. New Structures for Accountability	__ Yes	__ No
l. School Incentive Programs	__ Yes	__ No
m. New Roles for Teaching Specialties	__ Yes	__ No
n. Innovative Personnel Policies	__ Yes	__ No
o. New Structures for Students with Special Needs	__ Yes	__ No

2. Please identify restructuring efforts in your state that you believe merit special recognition due to their success or innovation

Program Title: _____

Program Location: _____

Brief Description/Purpose:

_____

_____

_____

Contact Person: _____ _____Phone: _____

Program Title: _____

Program Location: _____

Brief Description/Purpose:

_____

_____

_____

Contact Person: _____Phone: _____

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Program Title: _____

Program Location: _____

Brief Description/Purpose:

_____

_____

_____

Contact Person: _____Phone: _____

Program Title: _____

Program Location: _____

Brief Description/Purpose:

_____

_____

_____

Contact Person: _____Phone: _____

3. Have changes been made in your state's statutes or policies to facilitate restructuring efforts?

__Yes __No

4. (If you answered question 3 "YES") Briefly describe those statute or policy changes.

_____

_____

_____

_____

Who should we contact if we have additional questions about restructuring efforts in your state?

Name: _____

Title: _____

Telephone: _____

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix 3
District Representative/Superintendent Restructuring Interview Protocol

1. What is the history of the school system and the restructuring program?

2. What is your background in relationship to the district and change?

3. What kind of support do the district schools receive?

4. What type of relationship does the central office have with the schools?

5. What initiated the restructuring effort at the district level?

6. How was the restructuring process implemented?

7. What are the elements of the district restructuring program?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix 4
Principal Restructuring Interview Protocol

1. What is the history of the school and the restructuring program?

2. What is your background in relationship to the school and change?

3. What kind of district support is received by the school?

4. What type of relationship does the central office have with the school?

5. What initiated the restructuring effort at the school?

6. How was the restructuring process implemented at the school?

7. What are the elements of the school restructuring program?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix 5
Teacher Perceptions of Restructuring Interview Protocol

One of the most recent attempts to improve schooling is called "restructuring schools". This is a broad-based attempt to reform education by ensuring: (1) that important decisions (for example curriculum, budget, personnel, etc.) are made at the school level rather than at the district office; and (2) that teachers are equal partners (with the principal and parents) in making these decisions.

In this study I am trying to understand what "restructuring means from the perspective of classroom teachers. Your answers to the several questions listed below will help do this. Your cooperation and thoughtful description are greatly appreciated.

NOTE: Questions 1 and 2 are deliberately non-specific. I want to know what teachers think about restructuring without laying on them my ideas or frameworks of where I see possible changes. It is important to hear their thoughts before the focused questions (3-6) occur -even if their responses are limited.

1. a) What do you think of the idea of restructured schools? A good idea; bad idea?
   b) Do you think that "restructuring schools" will have an impact on anything? Any group? If so, who will be affected and how?
2. What types of broad changes do you think need to be made to make restructuring work?

This school and school system have the reputation of being "restructured". The next questions are about your knowledge and involvement in the restructuring of the district and this school.

3. What type of changes have been made over the past few years in this school that would be considered restructuring efforts. Changes made at the school level - not within your individual classroom, but things that would affect all teachers (for example, changes in the classroom schedule).

4. One of the major reasons that teachers and others are trying to restructure schools is to improve student learning. The belief is that if important decisions are made close to the students (that is, by the school staff rather than by district staff) and if teachers and possibly students, are heavily involved in those decisions, things will improve for students. In your school what changes have been made to improve student learning at the classroom level?

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

a) in the teaching-learning process (that is, the way teachers teach and the way students learn).
b) in your relationship with students
c) in the climate or atmosphere in classrooms

5. The following topics are often mentioned as possible areas where change might occur in schools where the teachers and the principals together make decisions and in which they have considerable authority over each area.

What is the school's responsibility for these areas and how involved are you in each of these?

a) school budget (the way money is spent, including funds for personnel)
b) the curriculum
c) the climate/atmosphere of the school
d) professional development- curriculum and instruction, administrative decisions
e) the school schedule (length of year; school day; class periods, team scheduling, etc.)
f) the way teachers spend their time
g) the way teachers teach
h) the way students are organized for learning (grade level, class level is by ability vs. interest; homogenous vs. heterogenous)
i) procedures used to manage student behavior
j) outcomes for students
k) student interactions with other students
l) student interactions with you
m) the culture/climate of the classroom

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Appendix 6
Classroom Observation Instrument (COI)

RATING FORM FOR QUALITATIVE OBSERVATION FIELD NOTES

School_____ Date_____

Grade_____

Directions for use: Rate the classroom observation using field notes and the cues from the following page.

	Poor				**Excellent**
1. Get the show on the road..... (must have 85% time on task to code 4)	1	2	3	4	5
2. Grouping of students.....1 (must be intradependent and heterogeneous to code 4)		2	3	4	5
3. Present new content and skills.....1 (must have at least three components to code 4)		2	3	4	5
4. Command of subject matter.....1		2	3	4	5
5. Integration of knowledge and skills across disciplines.....1 (must tap at least 2 disciplines to code 4)		2	3	4	5
6. Innovative student work activities.....1 (must take less than 50% of time to code 4)		2	3	4	5
7. Independent practice.....1 (must take less than 35% of time to code 4)		2	3	4	5
8. Teacher expectations.....1		2	3	4	5
9. Positive reinforcement.....1		2	3	4	5

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

10. Number of interruptions (one or none to code 4; subjective interpretation in coding 1.2,3)	1	2	3	4	5
11. Discipline	1	2	3	4	5
12. Friendly ambience	1	2	3	4	5
13. Characteristics of room	1	2	3	4	5
A. Presence of student's work	1	2	3	4	5
B. Teacher's input	1	2	3	4	5

"GET (AND KEEP) THE SHOW ON THE ROAD"

Classes start promptly

Percent of the time spent on academics vs. social/managerial

Orderly and reasonably disciplined environment (students know what to and do it.

GROUPING OF STUDENTS

Small, intradependent, heterogeneous groups

Student Team Learning methods

Group-Investigation - students problem solved in groups; students use resources within and outside of the school; students analyze and evaluate information

Student as worker/teacher as coach

Active engagement of students

PRESENT NEW CONTENT AND SKILLS

Provide overview

Proceed at a rapid pace

Give detailed (if necessary, redundant, instructions, and explanations

New skills phased in while old skills are being mastered

Everyone understands what they are doing

COMMAND OF SUBJECT MATTER

Teacher has firm grasp of subject matter

No factual errors made in presentation of subject matter

Teacher able to provide additional information on points of student interests

INTEGRATION OF KNOWLEDGE AND SKILLS ACROSS DISCIPLINES

Activities require student creativity, planning, performance, and/or physical activity such as might be involved in experiments, interviews, or model building

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

INDEPENDENT PRACTICE SO THAT STUDENTS ARE FIRM AND AUTOMATIC
Some silent seatwork (not over 35% of time)
Teacher or aide monitoring to insure student engagement
High percentage correct during seatwork
OVERALL HIGH TEACHER EXPECTATION FOR ACHIEVEMENT

CLEAR, SPECIFIC, ACADEMIC RELATED PRAISE AND/OR OTHER REWARDS

NUMBER OF INTERRUPTIONS DURING THE PERIOD (KIDS COME IN, INTERCOM, JANITOR, ETC.

FEW DISCIPLINE PROBLEMS - THOSE THAT ARISE ARE HANDLED QUICKLY AND WITH MINIMUM DISTURBANCE TO OTHER STUDENTS.

DOES THE CLASS SEEM LIKE A FRIENDLY PLACE?

PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF THE ROOM

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

Vita

Sharon Lee Pol is a native and resident of Baton Rouge, Louisiana. She taught for twenty years in the East Baton Rouge public school system as both an elementary school teacher and a librarian. During that time, she earned three graduate degrees from Louisiana State University in education and library science. Upon her retirement, she served an appointment with the Louisiana State Department of Education in the Bureau of Professional Accountability. In 1989, she entered the doctoral program at Louisiana State University in the Department of Administrative and Foundational Services and anticipates the awarding of a doctor of philosophy degree in December 1996. She has presented papers on educational topics in San Francisco, New York, Chicago, New Orleans, and Atlanta. She has a daughter who attends Louisiana State University. She is also active in civic and educational organizations. She is currently self-employed as an educational consultant and program evaluator.

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.

DOCTORAL EXAMINATION AND DISSERTATION REPORT

Candidate: Sharon Lee Pol

Major Field: Educational Administration and Supervision

Title of Dissertation: Restructuring in Louisiana Schools

Approved:

Major Professor and Chairman

Dean of the Graduate School

EXAMINING COMMITTEE:

Date of Examination:

10/30/96

Reproduced with permission of the copyright owner. Further reproduction prohibited without permission.